ARIS & PHILLIPS CLASSICAL TEXTS

Minor Greek Tragedians

Volume 2: Fourth-Century and Hellenistic Poets

Fragments from the Tragedies with Selected Testimonia

EDITED WITH INTRODUCTIONS, TRANSLATIONS AND NOTES

M. J. Cropp

ARIS AND PHILLIPS CLASSICAL TEXTS

Minor Greek Tragedians

Fragments from the Tragedies with Selected Testimonia

Edited with Introductions, Translations and Notes

by

M. J. Cropp

VOLUME 2

Fourth-Century and Hellenistic Poets

LIVERPOOL UNIVERSITY PRESS

First published 2021 by
Liverpool University Press
4 Cambridge Street
Liverpool
L69 7ZU

www.liverpooluniversitypress.co.uk

Copyright © 2021 M. J. Cropp

The right of Martin J. Cropp to be identified as the author of this book has been asserted by him in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication data
A British Library CIP record is available

ISBN 9781800348721 cased
eISBN 9781800345713

Typeset by Tara Montane

Cover image: Chaeremon, *Achilles*. Mixing bowl (volute krater), style resembling the Varrese Painter. Greek, South Italian (Apulia), about 340 B.C. Museum of Fine Arts Boston, Bartlett Collection, purchased with funds from the Francis Bartlett Donation of 1900, accession number 03.804. Photograph © 2021, Museum of Fine Arts Boston.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 2

Preface v

Introduction vii

Texts, Translations and Notes

- Dicaeogenes (*TrGF* 52) 3
- Antiphon (*TrGF* 55) 11
- Patrocles of Thurii (*TrGF* 58) 20
- Astydamas I (*TrGF* 59) 23
- Astydamas II (*TrGF* 60) 24
- Sophocles II (*TrGF* 62) 54
- Carcinus II (*TrGF* 70) 60
- Chaeremon (*TrGF* 71) 91
- Theodectas (*TrGF* 72) 130
- Aphareus (*TrGF* 73) 169
- Dionysius of Syracuse (*TrGF* 76) 172
- Cleaenetus (*TrGF* 84) 200
- Diogenes of Sinope (*TrGF* 88) 203
  - Appendix: Philiscus of Aegina, Crates of Thebes (*TrGF* 89, 90) 229
- Sosiphanes I (*TrGF* 92) 232
- Moschion (*TrGF* 97) 241
- The Pleiad 270
  - Aeanti(a)des, Sosiphanes II, Dionysi(a)des, Euphronius (*TrGF* 102, 103, 105, 106) 274
  - Homer of Byzantium (*TrGF* 98) 276
  - Sositheus (*TrGF* 99) 281
  - Lycophron of Chalcis (*TrGF* 100) 288
  - Alexander of Aetolia (*TrGF* 101) 296
  - Philicus of Corcyra (*TrGF* 104) 300

Nicomachus of Alexandria Troas (*TrGF* 127) 306
Ezechiel (*TrGF* 128) 310
Unidentified poets 369
Adesp. F 649: The death of Hector 371
Adesp. F 644: Lament of Andromache 380
Adesp. F 664: Gyges 386
Hyginus, *Fab.* 100: *Teuthras* 394
Hyginus, *Fab.* 120–121 (Adesp. F 10c): *Chryses* 399
Hyginus, *Fab.* 122 (Adesp. F *3e): *Aletes* 404
Hyginus, *Fab.* 190: *Theonoe* 407
Abbreviations and references 411
Indexes (Poets, Titles, Sources, General) 441
Corrections to Volume One 455

PREFACE

A first volume of *Minor Greek Tragedians* devoted to poets of the fifth century B.C. appeared in 2019. This second volume was originally limited to the fourth and third centuries but with Ezechiel's *Exagôgê* (perhaps from the second century) and some further imprecisely dated material it now includes almost all the text-fragments that can be dated with any confidence down to the end of the Hellenistic period. A few minor exceptions are listed in note 5 on page ix, and there are of course other possibilities in the authorless fragments (*adespota*: see for example pages xvi n. 23, xvii n. 24 and 369 nn. 1 and 2). In completing this volume I have profited greatly from the expert advice of Marco Fantuzzi, Patrick Finglass, John Gibert, Donald Mastronarde and Alan Sommerstein, each of whom read a complete draft and supplied many corrections and improvements, and of Robert Cousland similarly with regard to Ezechiel's *Exagôgê*. I am more than grateful to all of these and gladly admit responsibility for any defects that may remain. Some corrections to Volume I are listed at the end of this volume.

Martin Cropp
May 2021

INTRODUCTION

The first volume of this edition was concerned with tragedy from its earliest development at Athens to the end of the fifth century. That development took place largely within Attica and perhaps in the second half of the century in a few Athenian-dominated Aegean islands and some cities on the coast of southern Italy which had close ties with Athens. We hear of occasional productions in Sicily (Syracuse as early as the 470s, probably Gela in Aeschylus's lifetime), Macedonia (for the ruler Archelaus after 413) and perhaps Epirus (if Euripides' *Andromache* was produced for the Molossian court in the 420s), but so far as our limited information goes it suggests that throughout the fifth century tragedy remained essentially an Athenian property.[1] The last years of the century mark an epoch with the deaths of Euripides and Sophocles in 406 and 405 followed by the fall of Athens to the Spartans in 404 and the restoration of its democracy in 403. A further epoch is marked by the death of Alexander the Great in 323 after his conquest of the Persian empire and the ending of the fourth-century Athenian democracy in the following year. The period included in this volume can thus be crudely divided between a 'short' fourth century (403–323) and the Hellenistic period (ending with the completion of the Roman conquest of the Hellenistic kingdoms in 31 BC), in which Hellenic culture spread beyond its earlier boundaries throughout what is now called the Middle East.

For the fourth century what we know about tragedy in any detail continues to come mainly from Athens, and for both periods there is much less information than for the fifth century. There are no complete texts except the anonymous *Rhesus*, dwindling didascalic evidence for productions in Athens or Attica and little for those elsewhere, no equivalent to the contemporary responses seen in Aristophanes' comedies of 425–405 and no commentary tradition on either tragedies or comedies. There is nevertheless abundant evidence for the vitality of tragedy as a performance genre and its gradual proliferation throughout the Hellenistic world. The evidence is mainly archaeological (physical evidence of theatres, theatre-related artefacts etc.), epigraphic (inscribed

[1] Cf. Vol. 1, pp. xvi–xviii.

festival records, honorific decrees etc.) with an assortment of literary references. A recent survey finds evidence of theatrical performances at more than forty sites outside Attica by the end of the fourth century, including cities in Ionia, Caria, Libya (Cyrene) and the Propontis (Byzantium) as well as central and northern Greece, a dozen Aegean islands, southern Italy and Sicily, though some of these may not have featured tragedies and some may been occasional events.[2] A similar survey for the Hellenistic period notes inscriptional evidence for tragic contests at annual festivals in about forty cities in Greece and the Aegean area, more than half of them attested already in the third century.[3] This evidence consists of snapshots taken at specific points in time and represents the tip of a presumably much larger iceberg.

We know of more than ninety poets composing tragedies in these four centuries,[4] but for most there are only names and in a few cases play-titles and/or numbers of productions. Many of them, and nearly all after the mid-third century, are known only from inscriptions, which provide valuable evidence for the theatrical activity of their time but tell us little or nothing about them or their plays. The number of poets from

---

[2] Csapo–Wilson 2015 with tables on pp. 321, 331 etc. and concluding summary pp. 381–83. They now present and discuss the evidence exhaustively in *SEHT* II, 275–808. Cf. Le Guen 2019, 149–57, Vahtikari 2014 (evidence for performances).

[3] Le Guen 2019, 157–63 with tables and references to her earlier studies. See also Ceccarelli 2010, Miles 2016, Fountoulakis 2017, Braund et al. 2019 (Black Sea cities).

[4] *TrGF* I^2, pp. vi–viii lists 118 names (*plus* 13 incomplete ones from inscriptions), and 2 more in its *Addenda* (56A Megaclides, early 4th C.; 143A Polyxenus, 2nd C.); add 215 Zenodotus (3rd/2nd C.: »» *TrGF* 5.1114) and possibly a Nicostratus (early 4th C.: see p. 239 on Sosiphanes I **F 4**), the Nicomachus who competed at the Lenaea of 364 (below, pp. 306f.) and Xenoclides of Athens ([Dem.] 59. 26–26: *SEHT* II.468). No. 57 Patrocles of Athens should be deleted (below, pp. 20f.), and ten others are at best doubtfully included (51 Pamphilus, 53 Ariphron, 54 Polychares, 58 Cleophon [cf. Vol. 1, p. 124], 78 Polyidus, 117 Theaetetus, 120 Archytas, 121 Phanes, 139 Thymoteles, 178 Asinius Pollio). Fourteen are recorded only as prize-winners for satyr-plays in 2nd–1st C. inscriptions but could have produced tragedies as well. Some composed paratragic discourses (88–90 Diogenes, Philiscus?, Crates? [below, pp. 204f., 229–31], 112 Timon, 144 Diogenes of Tarsus) or forgeries (93 Heraclides Ponticus, 113 Dionysius of Heraclea). Many of the Hellenistic tragic poets are briefly surveyed in Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 113–78.

whom any text survives is much smaller; nearly all are included in this volume, along with some others from whom we have no text at all.[5] What we know about their plays depends on the vagaries of the ancient and Byzantine sources which quote or mention them. As with the fifth-century poets (Vol. I, pp. xviii–xxi), most of it comes from a handful of authors, especially Aristotle writing in the mid-fourth century, the learned miscellany of Athenaeus compiled towards the end of the second century AD, the fifth-century anthology of Stobaeus (John of Stobi in Macedonia) and the tenth-century encyclopedia known as the Suda. Aristotle, Athenaeus and Stobaeus supply two-thirds of all our text-fragments and references to dramatic contents, while the Suda provides some (often minimal) information about all but four of the poets.[6]

Amongst these sources only Aristotle provides contemporary comment and is by far the most informative on the contents of tragedies of the short fourth century. Nearly everything we know about the subject-matter and plots of plays by Dicaeogenes, Antiphon, Carcinus II and Theodectas comes from his *Poetics*, *Rhetoric* and *Ethics*, although his comments are conditioned and their value limited by his particular reasons for citing them as examples, whether of plot-design or ethical

[5] Only six are represented by more than a dozen verses (Astydamas II, Carcinus II, Chaeremon and Theodectas from the mid-4th century, Moschion late 4th/early 3rd, Ezechiel probably early 2nd). In all the volume contains around 700 verses including 269 from Ezechiel's *Exagôgê* and some incomplete verses on papyri. A few poets not included here are represented by a handful of sententious verses quoted out of context: *TrGF* 215 Zenodotus (3rd/2nd C., a couplet from Stobaeus), 131 Melanthius II (2nd C., a verse from Plutarch), 152 Apollonides (2nd C.?, two excerpts from Stobaeus), 179 Aeschylus of Alexandria (1st C.?, a couplet from Athenaeus). Also in Stobaeus but undated and some perhaps not tragic: 205 Biotus (a couplet from his *Medea*), 207 Demonax (two verses), 208 Dionysius Scymnaeus (one verse), 210 Hippothoon? (five excerpts, eight verses), 211 Isidorus (two excerpts, five verses), 213 Sclerias (two excerpts, five verses), 216 Zopyrus (one couplet).

[6] The exceptions are Antiphon, Patrocles, Cleaenetus and Moschion. The entries for Diogenes of Sinope (Suda δ 143, 144) do not mention tragedies. Nine others not included in this volume have brief entries in the Suda: *TrGF* 50 Empedocles (grandson of the 5th C. philosopher: '24 tragedies'), 64 Apollodorus of Tarsus (4th C.?, six titles), 79 Achaeus II (4th C., 'ten tragedies'), 147 Sophocles III (2nd–1st C. descendant of the classic tragedian), 172 Nicolaus of Damascus (1st C.), and uncertainly dated 201 Alcimenes, 203 Antiphanes(?), 212 Phrynichus II (two titles), 214 Timesitheus (thirteen titles).

decisions or types of argument (his comment in the *Rhetoric* on Carcinus's *Medea* is now supplemented by the papyrus fragment **F 1e *add.***). For others of this period our knowledge comes from a random variety of sources. Sophocles II (the great poet's grandson who produced his posthumous *Oedipus at Colonus*) had a substantial dramatic career in the first three decades of the fourth century, but his work can only be identified (uncertainly) in some scraps of a Hellenistic papyrus text published in 1999. Astydamas II (great-great-grandson of a sister of Aeschylus and a leading poet of the mid-fourth century) is quoted once in the *Poetics* and (surprisingly) only four times by Stobaeus, but his *Hector* is represented (probably) by no fewer than three Hellenistic papyri (the only papyri of fourth-century tragedy so far identified besides those of Sophocles II and Carcinus just mentioned), and his *Antigone* may be reflected approximately in a contemporary South Italian vase-painting and/or in one of Hyginus's *Fables* (see pp. 31–33 below). Nearly all the quotations from named tragedies of Chaeremon are in two passages of Athenaeus, who quotes them for their picturesque descriptions of flowers, garlands and female bodies, whereas his *Achilles* (quoted uninformatively by Stobaeus and the Suda) is probably epitomized in the magnificent mid-fourth century vase-painting shown in part on the cover of this book (cf. p. 99–101 below). For the tyrant Dionysius I of Syracuse, Athenaeus and Stobaeus quote from three named plays (*Adonis*, *Alcmene*, *Leda*), but our only substantive information concerns a scene from his otherwise unknown *Ransoming of Hector* mentioned by the Byzantine scholar John Tzetzes more than fifteen hundred years after the play's production. Key features of a few 'tragedies' of the Cynic philosopher Diogenes of Sinope (actually paratragic discourses not meant for the theatre) are known from later philosophical references. What we know about the content of any of these plays without resorting to inferences from titles, vase-paintings[7] and other guesswork is thus

[7] Taplin 2007, ch. 5 discusses twenty-seven 4th-century South Italian and Sicilian vases as probably or possibly evoking (or in nos 105–6 depicting) tragic scenes which must then be from 5th- or 4th-century tragedies. About half do so quite probably, but in half of those the mythical subjects cannot be identified and those with identifiable subjects do not seem to reflect known plays other than Chaeremon's *Achilles* (no. 91; the vase perhaps related to Astydamas's *Antigone* is Taplin's no. 62 under Euripides). Some vases less plausibly connected with known plays are discussed below, pp. 18 (Antiphon, *Meleager*), 25 n. 3 (Astydamas, *Parthenopaeus*), 36f. (Astydamas, *Hector*), 72f. (Carcinus, *Medea*),

sadly little. We have glimpses of Antiphon's *Andromache* and *Meleager*, Dionysius's *Ransoming of Hector*, Astydamas's *Alcmeon*, Carcinus's *Ajax, Alope*, *Medea* and *Orestes*, and Theodectas's *Ajax* and *Philoctetes*, and somewhat fuller impressions of Astydamas's *Hector* (and perhaps *Antigone*), Chaeremon's *Achilles* and Theodectas's *Lynceus*. The *Rhadamanthys* and *Tennes* included uncertainly in the Euripidean corpus by Alexandian scholars and ascribed to Critias by Wilamowitz might have been fourth-century plays (»» Vol. 1, pp. 212–17; Cropp 2020b). Outweighing all of these is the one extant but perhaps untypical fourth-century tragedy, the anonymous *Rhesus*, which again owes its survival to being taken for a play of Euripides.[8]

After Aristotle's time the record is still more obscure. From named poets we have a brief sketch of the plot of Alexander of Aetolia's *Dice-Players* from a Homeric commentator and extensive excerpts from the (untypical) *Exodus*-tragedy of the Jewish poet Ezechiel made by a Greek scholar residing in Rome in the first century BC and recycled by a Christian bishop some 350 years later. For other samples of the contents and character of Hellenistic tragedy we have to turn to anonymous material such as the papyrus fragments and mythographic summaries included at the end of this volume.

From the early fourth century tragedy was increasingly a panhellenic rather than a purely Athenian property, and one that carried significant cultural prestige. This was a gradual process; most of the known fourth-century tragedians were either Athenian or associated with Athens,[9] and Athens maintained its position as tragedy's metropolis at

---

108 n. 23 (Chaeremon, *Oeneus*), 143 (Theodectas, *Lynceus*), 177f. (Dionysius, *Adonis*).

[8] *Rhesus* is now generally considered a fourth-century play, although its precise dating and provenance are still debated: »» Liapis 2012, lxvii–lxx, Fries 2014, 22–47, Fantuzzi 2020a, 24–50 (more briefly Liapis 2017, 368–70, Fries 2019, 83–86, Fantuzzi 2020b).

[9] Of some three dozen practising 4th C. tragedians known to us at least twenty-seven were Athenian. The exceptions are Dionysius, Achaeus II and Sosiphanes I (all from Syracuse), Patrocles of Thurii, Empedocles of Acragas, Apollodorus of Tarsus (if this is the didascalic records' Apollodorus, *TrGF* no. 64), Theodectas of Phaselis and (at the end of 4th C.) Phanostratus of Halicarnassus. Theodectas studied, practised and died at Athens (see pp. 130f.). All the others except Empedocles and Patrocles are known to have won victories there. Seven other

least through the short fourth century. But there was increasing competition for the services of tragic poets and actors and for sponsorship of tragic productions at the courts of rulers and elsewhere.[10] The migration of tragedy from its original home must have had an impact on the contents of tragedies produced for different sponsors and different audiences, as well as on the ways in which performances were organized and delivered in a wide variety of contexts;[11] even at Athens there was now less incentive to focus plays on specifically Athenian concerns. The evidence is negative and impressionistic (often mere titles), but virtually all of our information from the short fourth century seems to concern plays based on traditional myths. Many no doubt treated their subjects creatively or exploited previously undramatized episodes,[12] but there is no obvious sign of tragedies with Athenian subjects comparable with Aeschylus's *Persians* and *Eumenides*, Euripides' *Children of Heracles*, *Suppliant Women* and *Erechtheus*, or Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*. A few exceptional examples point to the influence that sponsors could have in special cases. Theodectas's *Mausolus,* commissioned by the ruler of Halicarnassus's widow in 352, celebrated either the ruler himself or a mythical forebear (below, p. 145). Carcinus **F 5** presumably advertised the Sicilian cult of Demeter and Persephone on behalf of Dionysius II of Syracuse (below, pp. 87f.). *Rhesus* seems to reflect an interest in Macedonia and may have been composed at least partly with a Macedonian audience in mind.[13] The Hellenistic period shows further

---

incomplete names appear in Athenian didascalic records. (*TrGF* nos 63, 65–69, 74). It should of course be kept in mind that our sources are nearly all Athenian.

[10] For tragedy at Syracuse in the 4th C. see pp. 172f. on Dionysius I with pp. 11 (Antiphon) and 60 (Carcinus); at Pherae(?), below, p. 63; in Macedonia, Moloney 2003, 2014; at Halicarnassus, below, pp. 144f. (Theodectas's *Mausolus*); in the Bosporan kingdom, Braund 2019.

[11] Duncan–Liapis 2019 provides a general survey of post-fifth century performance. The rise of professional actors: Csapo 2010, 83–116. Actors' guilds ('Artists of Dionysus') in the Hellenistic period: below, p. 303 n. 7.

[12] Dicaeogenes' *Cyprians* (pp. 4f. below), Astydamas's *Hector* (pp. 34–42), Chaeremon's *Achilles* and *Io* (pp. 96–102, 104f.) and Theodectas's *Lynceus* (pp. 140–45) are possible cases, although we know too little about the earlier repertoire to be sure about any of this.

[13] »» Liapis 2009 (discussed sceptically by Fries 2014, 18–21); Fantuzzi 2020a, 41–49; 2020b, 432–36.

evidence of plays designed to appeal to local rulers or cities together with a renewed openness to subjects drawn from more recent history.[14]

With so little evidence it is hardly possible to reach large conclusions about developments in the content and character of postclassical tragedy, but some features are evident at least among those produced at Athens in the fourth century which supply most of our knowledge.[15] Poets of the time seem to have opted for refinement and variation, developing trends already established in the later fifth century rather than introducing radical changes in dramatic content or design. Myths could be reworked (as in Carcinus's *Alope* and *Medea* and probably Astydamas's *Antigone*) or previously unused episodes dramatized (above, n. 12), but these were well-established tragic practices. One notable feature is the increased prominence of rhetorical performance. Aristotle remarked that in his day rhetoric had become a requirement of the tragic art and rhetorically accomplished actors more important to audiences than poets (*Rhetoric* 1403b22ff. and 32f.), that poets now made their characters speak like trained orators rather than regular citizens (*Poetics* 1450b7), and that they distorted their plots to provide actors with better opportunities for rhetorical display (*Poetics* 1451b34ff.).[16] This highlighting of rhetoric was presumably seen in emblematic scenes such as the arms debates of Carcinus's *Ajax* and Theodectas's *Ajax*, the trials in Carcinus's *Medea* and *Orestes* and Theodectas's *Lynceus*, and the dispute over Achilles' guilt in Chaeremon's *Achilles*.[17] Other key scenes seem to have analysed, again in rhetorical fashion, the ethical and emotional motivations of characters reaching crucial decisions: Meleager's relatives reacting to his spurning

[14] Historical subjects: Moschion's *Themistocles* and probably *Pheraeans* (pp. 244–49 below); Lycophron's *Cassandreians* and perhaps *Marathonians* (pp. 290f.). Mythical subjects responding to local interests: the Telephus-tragedy in Hyginus, *Fab.* 100 (pp. 394–98), Dymas of Iasos's *Dardanus* (*TrGF* no. 130, early 2nd C.: »» Rutherford 2007; Hornblower 2019, 91f.; *SEHT* II.732f.).

[15] Moschion probably belongs in this category (probably Athenian, probably late 4th/early 3rd C.). On tendencies in 4th C. tragedy see especially Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, Easterling 1993, Kuch 1993, Seidensticker 1995, Hall 2007 (early 4th C.), Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 63–65, Dunn 2019, Carter 2019.

[16] Astydamas II, Theodectas and Aphareus all studied rhetoric with Isocrates.

[17] The artificially motivated disputes of *Rhesus* 393–453 and 833–78 seem to reflect a similar tendency.

of them (Antiphon, *Meleager*), Andromache deciding to give up her son for adoption (Antiphon, *Andromache*), Achilles responding to Priam's plea for his son's corpse (Dionysius, *The Ransoming of Hector*), Hector determining to face Achilles (Astydamas, *Hector*), Cercyon trying and failing to live with his daughter's disgrace (Carcinus, *Alope*), Philoctetes trying and failing to bear the agony of his wound (Theodectas, *Philoctetes*). Often the rhetoric will have been designed, as in lawcourt defences, to heighten sympathy for a character and his or her predicament. A similar ethical sensibility is seen in some cases where (with Aristotle's approval) playwrights adjusted a myth to make a crime less shocking or lessen a character's guilt. Astydamas's Alcmeon kills his own mother unknowingly, Carcinus's Cercyon spares his seduced daughter and kills himself instead, and his Medea has apparently not killed her own sons (Carcinus **F 1e**). Dunn (2019, 263ff.) suggests that some fourth-century plays followed examples such as Euripides' *Andromeda* and Sophocles' *Philoctetes* in exploring emotional and ethical interactions ('changing affective ties') between characters; to his examples (Antiphon's *Andromache*, Carcinus's *Alope*, Theodectas's *Philoctetes*) one might add Dionysius's *Ransoming of Hector*. Divine influences on human action seem to have been less fundamental than in many fifth-century tragedies, at least so far as our evidence goes, as the pendulum swung towards human psychology and motivations.

There is little direct evidence for plot design and dramatic structure in fourth-century tragedies, although structural elements such as prologues, messenger-speeches and gods *ex machina* can occasionally be observed or more often inferred (see the Index entries for these items). The nearest we get to whole plots is in Aristotle's brief sketch of Theodectas's *Lynceus* and the summary of Hyginus which may reflect Astydamas's *Antigone* (below, pp. 31f.). There is no sign of major departures from fifth-century practice in this respect. Besides deliberation, debate and trial, plots often revolved around the motifs of lost or concealed identity, discovery, recognition and reunion with consequent reversals of fortune, deployed in multiple combinations and variations. Dicaeogenes' *Cyprians* featured the revelation of a hero's identity modelled on the Phaeacian episode of the *Odyssey*. Astydamas's Alcmeon killed his mother unknowingly and only later learned her identity, and his *Antigone* probably turned on the exposure of the heroine's marriage with Haemon and the existence of their adult son. That play and Carcinus's *Thyestes* (or *Aerope*?) both involved

recognitions by means of a birthmark. Carcinus's *Tyro* probably reworked the Sophoclean plot in which Tyro was rescued from servitude by her long-lost twin sons. In Theodectas's *Lynceus* the secretly born son of Lynceus and Hypermestra was discovered by Hypermestra's father Danaus, and Danaus's attempt to have Lynceus executed led to his own death. His *Tydeus* seems to have featured a recognition between father and son which rescued the father from death. Motifs of this kind, a staple also of Menander's New Comedy (with less extreme dangers) continued to be invented and elaborated in tragedies of the Hellenistic period, as in the plots summarized by Hyginus (below, pp. 394–410).

Such plots do not call for much in the way of spectacle or active stagecraft, except perhaps in the appearances of gods (which Aristotle at least thought should be confined to providing information at the beginnings or ends of plays: *Poetics* 1454b2–6). *Rhesus* on the other hand has a plethora of onstage action reflecting the events of *Iliad* 10.[18] Its action takes place in darkness, night watches come and go, Hector is roused and holds a tactical meeting which sends Dolon to his death, Rhesus arrives with his horses, golden armour and barbarian trappings and takes his position in the Trojan lines, Odysseus and Diomedes emerge out of the darkness, Athena appears to direct them towards him and fools Paris by using Aphrodite's voice, Trojan guards chase Odysseus and Diomedes and fail to intercept them, Rhesus's charioteer reports his master's death and the theft of his horses, then quarrels with Hector about it, and finally the Muse appears with a lament for her son, a singing *dea ex machina*. We do not know how typical, or how eccentric, a plot of this kind might have been.

Rhesus is also our only substantial example of the use of a chorus in a postclassical tragedy, and it tells strongly against the assumption (now increasingly discredited) that tragic choruses generally declined into irrelevance after the fifth century.[19] This idea was based mainly on Aristotle's comment that some poets of his day failed to involve their choruses in the dramatic action and sometimes even composed songs as

[18] 'As in its language, we observe . . . a highly idiosyncratic mixture of 'old-style' and 'progressive' elements aimed apparently at indulging a later audience's tastes with a maximum of spectacle and naturalistic turns' (Fries 2014, 39).

[19] For the fourth century see in general Duncan–Liapis 2019, 200–2, Dunn 2019, 245–47, Griffith 2019, 211–17, and for detailed discussion Jackson 2020, 51–77, 139–65.

'inserts' (*embolima*) which had nothing to do with the plot (*Poetics* 1456a.25ff.). The comment is however quite vague and suggests only that these were practices that Aristotle wanted to discourage, not that they were prevalent in his time. It also reflects Aristotle's assumption that a play is an organism of which each element should be a functioning part (μόριον εἶναι τοῦ ὅλου, 1456a26), so that he sets the bar for relevance rather high, preferring plays in which choruses participated actively and their fortunes were intertwined with those of the main characters to those in which they were more loosely associated with them as support-groups or witnesses.[20] Thus *Rhesus* meets or even exceeds Aristotle's requirements as its chorus of Trojan soldiers goes about its guard-duties, rouses Hector, objects to his plans, approves Dolon's mission, prays to Apollo for its success, welcomes Rhesus's arrival with songs of praise, blunders after Odysseus and Diomedes and laments Rhesus's death and its implications for themselves and their city. Apart from this there are few traces of choruses in the extant remnants of fourth-century tragedy, although titles such as Dicaeogenes' *Cyprians* and Chaeremon's *Minyans* hint at them and (besides Aristotle) there is other circumstantial evidence.[21] The only direct indication is in Astydamas **F 1h** which contains the rubric ΧΟΡΟΥ ΜΕΛΟΣ, CHORAL SONG followed by sung or recitative verses which may also have belonged to the chorus. There are more than a dozen unattributed fragments of choral text which could be from either the fifth or the fourth century (or later),[22] and the rubric ΧΟΡΟΥ ΜΕΛΟΣ appears in three more possibly fourth-century tragic papyrus texts.[23] The rubric has sometimes been taken to mean that the poet did not compose his own odes, just as in the papyrus texts of Menander the notation ΧΟΡΟΥ routinely indicates an entr'acte performance by a dramatically irrelevant chorus. But dramatically relevant choruses could hardly be accommodated in the private, bourgeois

[20] This I think is what Aristotle meant by 'not as in Euripides but as in Sophocles'. This and other issues in this problematic passage are discussed by Mastronarde 2010, 145–52, Jackson 2020, 150–65.

[21] See e.g. Theodectas **T 2**, Dionysius **T1(b)**, Cleaenetus **T 2**. The closing anapaests of Sophocles II's *Achilles* (**F 2** A 12) were presumably choral.

[22] The more substantial ones are adesp. F 127, 129, 130, 167a, 167c.3–5, 482, 499, 509, 690–692 (if tragic), 701.1–9 (see p. 73). Anapaests: adesp. F 629.4–11(?), F 654.1–9, 18ff., F 680a.

[23] For relevant details and discussion see pp. 49f. on Astydamas **F 1h**, fr. 1.

situations typical of New Comedy, whereas there was no inherent reason not to use them in tragedies. More probably the rubrics in the tragic papyri indicate omissions of odes which were part of the original texts and could well have been dramatically or thematically relevant. The omissions, and the general rarity of choral passages in the fragments, are probably due to the biases of later readers who were mainly interested in the moral, rhetorical, cultural and linguistic content found in the spoken parts of tragedies. Actors' song is even rarer in the fragments,[24] although it must have been among the highlights of full-scale tragic productions and other virtuoso performances.[25]

For the Hellenistic period inscriptions show that choruses were sometimes included in full-scale productions of tragedies, although practices must have varied greatly according to the requirements and resources of the many different contexts in which tragedies were performed, adapted or excerpted.[26] So far as texts are concerned there are only some undated choral fragments (above, n. 22), some suggestive titles (Moschion's *Pheraeans*, Lycophron's *Suppliants*, *Allies*, *Marathonians*, *Cassandreians*; perhaps Nicomachus's *Mysians*) and the possibility of choruses in Ezechiel's *Exagôgê* and some of the Adespota discussed below.[27] Much remains open to conjecture, as is the case for many aspects of the tragedies composed in the Hellenistic period.[28]

---

[24] Possibly Sophocles II **F 2**, A 3 (p. 58). Adesp. F 126 and 137 may be examples but could be from the fifth century; likewise adesp. F 678, 679, 680a, 684, 685, all with later musical notation. The papyrus fragment of Carcinus's *Medea* (**F 1e add.**) is a dialogue adapted for sung performance (below, pp. 86f.), as are adesp. F 680b, 682, 686. **Adesp. F 649** seems to be an adaptation of a dialogue to include some singing of Cassandra's part (pp. 371–75). **Adesp. F 644** (Andromache's lament) is recitative rather then sung.

[25] »» Hall 2002. For music and dance generally in postclassical tragedy, see Griffith 2019.

[26] See in general Sifakis 1967, 113–26, 130–35, Le Guen 2019, 173–77, 179. Slater 2010 analyses the complex and varied logistics of some relevant festivals.

[27] Ezechiel, p. 314; the Gyges-tragedy, pp. 387, 392; Hyginus, *Fabb*. 100 and 190, pp. 396f., 409. Satyr-plays must have continued to include satyr-choruses; cf. Sositheus **T 2**, for example.

[28] See further pp. 273f. on the Pleiad, pp. 313–17 on Ezechiel, and introductions to the anonymous excerpts and plots at the end of this volume (pp. 369f. etc.).

This edition

Volume 1, pp. xxii–xxiii provided a general description of this edition. Volume 2 also uses *TrGF*'s numberings of testimonia and fragments, usually in the same order, with Testimonia (**T**) including general information about the poet and Fragments (**F**) including information about individual plays as well as actual text-fragments. For convenience I have kept *TrGF*'s numerical ordering of the poets, which generally reflects what is known about their productions at Athens but puts Astydamas II and Philocles II (nos 60–61) immediately after their father and Dionysius of Syracuse (no. 76) after several poets who were younger than him. Dates for Patrocles of Thurii (no. 58) are unknown (see pp. 20f.).

As before, the edition provides for each poet (1) a general introduction, (2) selected testimonia with translations, (3) text-fragments etc. with essential source-material, translations and introductions to some individual plays, and (4) explanatory notes. The apparatus accompanying the Greek texts is limited to significant corrections and continuing uncertainties. The following editorial markers are used:

In Greek texts:

[ ] enclose editorial supplements or other indications of text missing in papyri or inscriptions; also numbers of testimonia or fragments wrongly ascribed to the relevant author (e.g. **[T 2]**, **[F 9]**).

〈 〉 enclose editorial additions or indications of text judged to be missing in book-texts;

{ } enclose word(s) present in a text but judged inauthentic;

α̣ etc. subscript dots mark letters which are incomplete or uncertainly read in papyri or inscriptions; a dot under a blank space indicates a missing letter;

† † enclose words judged corrupt and not corrected;

— in dramatic dialogue indicates an unidentified speaker;

( ) enclose speakers' names (or —) supplied by conjecture.

In English translations, **[T]** and **[F]** numbers, corrupt words († †) and changes of speaker are marked as in the Greek text. Text-supplements are printed in *italics*, those that are likely but not certain within round brackets, the more tentative with a question-mark added. The basis for a supplement will usually be found in the critical apparatus below the Greek text.

Other:

~ in source-citations means ‘similarly or with minor differences’;

»» directs readers to fuller information and bibliography;

[ ] square brackets enclose the names of Greek authors wrongly or doubtfully identified with a given work;

[ ] in the Notes, bold-faced square brackets enclose technical discussions of text and language;

Bold-faced **T 1, F 1** etc. designate testimonia or fragments included in this edition.

MINOR GREEK TRAGEDIANS II

DICAEOGENES
(*TrGF* 52)

Texts etc. TrGF 1^2.190–92 with *addenda* 1^2.352, 5.1115.
Discussions. Hoffmann 1951, 153f. (chronology); Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 27f.

*Dicaeogenes was active in the early part of the fourth century, composing both tragedies and lyric works (**T 1**, **T 3**). The citation of **F 6?** suggests that he was active before the production of Aristophanes'* Ecclesiazusae (Assemblywomen) *in 391. A mid-fourth century inscription records the direction of a performance, probably choral and directed by this Dicaeogenes, at a rural Dionysia at Acharnae.*[1] *He is mentioned at least twice by Aristotle (**T 3**, **F 1**), his* Medea *was known to a Hellenistic commentator (**F 1a**), and **T 3** implies that Philodemus was aware of some of his work. A few quotations from his plays entered the gnomological tradition (**F 1b–5**). Nothing suggests that any of his texts were current after the Hellenistic period.*

[1] *IG* II^3 4, 500 (formerly II^2 3092) = *TrGF* DID B 6 = Dicaeogenes T 2: »» *SEHT* II.45–47 noting that this was not necessarily a recent performance.

T 1 Harpocration *δ* 64 (~ Photius *δ* 592, Suda *δ* 1064)
Δικαιογένης· τραγῳδίας οὗτος ποιητής. καὶ διθυράμβους ἔγραψε.

T 3 Philodemus, *On Poems* 4, P. Herc. 207 col. 120, ed. Janko 2011, 308–11
. . . *o]ὐδενὸς ἥττους μελοποῖας, [πλ]είονα* μ[ὲ]ν *εἴδη τὴν [τ]ρ[α]γῳδία[ν] π[ερι]έχειν* διδόσ[θω]· τὸ δ' *εἶ[δ]η δ' ἅπερ ἐστὶ κοινὰ τῆς αὐτῆς εἶναι τέχνης* οὐδεὶς ὁμολογήσει. καταγελάσεται δὲ πᾶς ἀκούων *μηδ' ἥττους ποεῖν Δικαιογ[έ]νην* — ἐῶμεν γὰρ μείζον[ας — *μ]ελοποῖας* τῶν Σ[ι]μων[ί]δου κ[α]ὶ Πινδάρου, κἀ[ν] ταῖς τραγωιδ[ί]αις οὕτως δ[υc]τυχοῦντα· χωρὶς τοῦ, κἂν πα[ρ]ιῆται ταῦτα, *Πίνδαρον μὲν [ἅ]περ εἰς τὴν τραγωιδίαν ἐχρῆ[ν] μὴ προσειληφέναι, Δικαιογένην δ' ἐσχηκέναι τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἔξω τῆς τρα[γ]ωιδ[ί]ας μελοποῖαν*.

ΚΥΠΡΙΟΙ

*Aristotle provides our only reference to this play (**F 1**), with no information except that someone in the play wept on seeing a* graphê *(probably a picture) and thus revealed his identity, as Odysseus did on hearing the Phaeacian bard's recital of the capture and sack of Troy (*Odyssey *8.521ff.). The play may likewise have involved a Greek hero recognized on his arrival in a foreign land, and the picture may have been a wall-painting showing scenes from the hero's own past, like the frieze showing scenes from the Trojan War which causes Aeneas to weep in Vergil's* Aeneid *1.453ff. The location was presumably Cyprus and the chorus of Cyprians local men. Two possible subjects have been suggested, both*

F 1 Aristotle, *Poetics* 1454b37–55a4
ἡ τρίτη (*sc.* ἀναγώρισις) διὰ μνήμης, τῷ αἰσθέσθαι τι ἰδόντα, ὥσπερ ἡ ἐν Κυπρίοις τοῖς Δικαιογένους, ἰδὼν γὰρ τὴν γραφὴν ἔκλαυσεν, καὶ ἡ ἐν Ἀλκίνου ἀπολόγῳ, ἀκούων γὰρ τοῦ κιθαριστοῦ καὶ μνησθεὶς ἐδάκρυσεν, ὅθεν ἀνεγνωρίσθησαν.

T 1 Harpocration, *Lexicon to the Ten Attic Orators*

Dicaeogenes: he was a tragic poet. He also wrote dithyrambs.

T 3 Philodemus, *On Poems*

(When Aristotle asserts that 'tragedy comprises several elements', that 'elements that are shared belong to the same art', and that 'Dicaeogenes composed) songs as good as anyone's', let it be granted that 'tragedy comprises several elements', but that 'elements that are shared belong to the same art' no one will agree. And everyone will laugh at it when he hears that 'Dicaeogenes composed songs as good as' — never mind better than — 'those of Simonides and Pindar', even though he was so unsuccessful in his tragedies; not to mention, even if these points are disregarded, the claim that 'Pindar had not acquired the additional elements that were needed for tragedy, whereas Dicaeogenes did possess those needed for song-composition outside tragedy'.

CYPRIANS

involving heroes returning from the Trojan War: either Theseus's son Demophon (or in some versions his brother Acamas), who in one legend died in Cyprus after abandoning the wife he had married in Thrace on his way home;[2] *or Ajax's half-brother Teucer, who was exiled from the island of Salamis by his father Telamon and founded the city of Salamis in Cyprus.*[3] *But all this remains speculative.*

F 1 Aristotle, *Poetics*

The third type (of recognition) is through recollection, by someone's feeling emotion on seeing something, like the one in Diaceogenes' *Cyprians* where he saw the picture and wept, and the one in the tale of Alcinous where he (i.e. Odysseus) listened to the lyre-player and remembering shed tears; and consequently they were recognized.

---

[2] Snell ascribes the suggestion to a note of Wilamowitz in his copy of Nauck's *TrGF*. For the legend and its variants see Apollodorus, *epit.* 6.16, Tzetzes on Lycophron 495, Hyginus *Fab.* 59, and others collected by Frazer 1921, II.262f., Pfeiffer on Callimachus fr. 556, Gantz 1993, 701f.; cf. Hornblower 2015, 232.

[3] Webster 1954, 298. On this legend and related plays see Vol. 1, pp. 86f. (Ion's *Teucer*). Lucas 1968, 170 mentions another suggestion, 'the secret return of Teucer to his old home at Salamis . . . and his self-betrayal by an emotional outburst', but does not explain why such a play would have had a chorus of Cyprians, nor why Teucer would have returned secretly. The story of his return to Salamis is late and abstruse (Pompeius Trogus in Justin's *epitome*, 44.3)

ΜΗΔΕΙΑ

Again our information is minimal. The play may have been about Medea's murder of her children, like Euripides' Medea *and other tragedies with this title, although* ***F 1a*** *suggests a possible focus on the murder of her brother (or half-brother), usually known as Apsyrtus, during the escape from Colchis. Poetic and mythographic accounts of his role in the story, and of the time and place of his murder, varied*

F 1a Schol. Eur. *Medea* 167

Δικαιογένης δὲ ἐν τῇ Μηδείᾳ Μεταπόντιον αὐτὸν ὀνομάζει.

Incertae Fabulae

F 1b Stobaeus 4.20.37

Δικαιογένους·

ὅταν δ' ἔρωτος ἐνδεθῶμεν ἄρκυσιν
θᾶσσον θυραίοις τὴν χάριν ποιούμεθα
ἢ τοῖς †ἀνάγκης† ἐν γένει πεφυκόσιν.

Δικαιογένους mss. SM Διογένους ms. A

F 2 Stobaeus 4.24.1

Δι⟨και⟩ογένους·

μακάριος ὅστις αὐτὸς ἰσχύων ἔτι
παῖδας παρασπίζοντας ἀλκίμους ἔχει.

Δι⟨και⟩ογένους Nauck Διογένους mss. SMA

F 3 Stobaeus 4.24.9, *text lost or misidentified*.[4]

[4] Stobaeus 4.24.9 is headed 'Dicaeogenes' in ms. S and 'Diogenes' in mss. MA (where these excerpts are also differently ordered), but the verses themselves are Euripides' *Orestes* 542f. Either a second quotation from Dicaeogenes about the value of having children has been lost or the heading was mistakenly repeated from **F 2**.

MEDEA

greatly, as did accounts of the Argonauts' return voyage from Colchis (»» Gantz 1993, 362–65; Fowler 2013, 227f.). The name Metapontius means 'Across-the sea' and was probably an ad hoc *invention. It was also the name of the legendary founding hero and ruler of Metapontium.*

***F 1b** could well belong to this play, referring to Medea's betrayal of her family because of her love for Jason (cf. Kayser 1845, 251f.).*

F 1a Scholia on Euripides' *Medea*

And Dicaeogenes in his *Medea* names him (i.e. Medea's brother) Metapontius.

Unidentified Plays

F 1b Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'Censure of Aphrodite, and that Eros is worthless *etc.*'

Dicaeogenes:

> When we become snared in the nets of love, we more readily perform our favour for those unrelated to us than for those who are † . . . . . † naturally our kin.

F 2 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'That it is good to have children'

Dicaeogenes:

> Happy the man who is still strong himself and has valiant sons bearing shields beside him.

F 3 *See opposite.*

F 4 Stobaeus 4.25.6

Δικαιογένους·

αὐτὸς τραφεὶς δὲ τῶν φυτευσάντων ὕπο
καλῶς, τὸν αὐτὸν ἔρανον αὐτοῖσιν νέμεις.

F 5 Stobaeus 4.25.33 (and derivatives; elsewhere without attribution)

Δικαιογένους·

θεὸς μέγιστος τοῖς φρονοῦσιν οἱ γονῆς.

Brief fragment(?): **F 6?** ὦ λαμπρὸν ὄμμα τοῦ τροχηλάτου . . .

F 4 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'That parents should be properly honoured by their children etc.'
Dicaeogenes:

> Well nurtured yourself by those who gave you life, now you are making the same contribution to them.

F 5 Stobaeus (as **F 4**)
Dicaeogenes:

> Parents are the greatest god for those who have good sense.

Brief fragment(?): **F 6?** O bright-shining eye of the chariot-drawn *(god)* . . .[5]

Notes on Dicaeogenes

T 1
Harpocration's information may be derived directly or indirectly from Aristotle (**T 3**). Why this Dicaeogenes is mentioned in his *Lexicon to the Ten Attic Orators* is unclear, perhaps just to distinguish him from the father and adoptive son so named in Isaeus 5 *On Dicaeogenes* and Lysias *Against Glaucon concerning the property of Dicaeogenes* (frs 71–74 Carey).

T 3

From a carbonized roll containing Book 4 of the treatise *On Poems* by the Epicurean philosopher Philodemus (1st C. BC), found in the Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum. The treatise in five books discussed the criteria for identifying 'good' poetry (»» Asmis 1995; Janko 2000, 120–93; Gutzwiller 2010, 359–64). **T 3** comes at the end of an extensive critique of Aristotle's poetic theory. Janko argues persuasively that the focus of this was Aristotle's lost dialogue *On Poets* (the quotations in **T 3** are F 27–30 in his edition of the fragments of that work: »» Janko 2011, 422–23 with explanation pp. 354–56, 358–59). Aristotle had observed that tragedy was a more complex form than epic because it was acted rather than just narrated and was further enhanced by music and song (*melopoiia*) in addition to the spoken word; with these features tragedy was a complex but nevertheless coherent art (*technê*), not a corrupt hybrid as conservative critics

[5] Schol. Ar. *Eccl.* 1: 'The verse is suspected to be either from Agathon or from Dicaeogenes'. See Agathon **F 32?** with note (Vol. 1, p. 167).

such as Plato had maintained. The example of Dicaeogenes apparently served to show that the art of lyric composition was not impaired by being 'added' to tragedy since Dicaeogenes had been an excellent lyric poet while also composing tragedies. To these arguments Philodemus objects that the combination of several elements in tragedy does not make it a coherent *technê*, that Dicaeogenes was no more an excellent lyric poet than he was an excellent tragedian, and that the mere fact that Dicaeogenes produced tragedies as well as lyric poetry, whereas Pindar did not, does not make Dicaeogenes a better poet than Pindar. Poets working in both genres seem to have been rare, but Ion of Chios was a notable example (Vol. 1, p. 77 with **T 3(b)**). Aristotle perhaps preferred to mention Dicaeogenes as a more recent example. Since *On Poets* was in dialogue form it is not clear that he actually held the opinions about Dicaeogenes that Philodemus criticizes; they may only have been proposed by one of the speakers in the dialogue.

F 1b

Possibly from *Medea* (above, p. 7). Erotic devotion makes a person forget their proper obligations to family and friends: cf. Plato, *Phaedrus* 252a. **our favour** (**τὴν χάριν**) is presumably the favour expected of us, or that we have chosen to offer (cf. Eur. *Pho.* 446, Thuc. 2.40.4); Dicaeogenes' context may have made this clearer. **[**The text of line 3 is incoherent and not easily mended. **ἀνάγκης** could refer to the kind of connection that makes people ἀναγκαῖοι to each other, i.e. relatives, close friends or dependents (cf. LSJ 'ἀναγκαῖος' II.5, where the qualification '*related by blood*' is misleading). The noun has this sense in Hdt. 1.74.4 and (according to Cropp 2020a, 49) Eur. *Hec.* 847.**]**

F 4, F 5

Both from Stobaeus's chapter on the honour owed by children to parents: cf. Agathon **F 28** with note (Vol. 1, p. 179). The idea that parents give care to their children as a **contribution** (»» LSJ 'ἔρανος') which the children will repay in kind or pass on to their own children was societally sanctioned with a specific name (θρεπτήρια or τροφεῖα) and became proverbial: cf. Eur. *Supp.* 363 with Collard's note, Diogenes Laertius 1.37 (= Thales A 1.37 DK, P 17c[37] Laks–Most) Antiphanes fr. 260 *PCG*, Alexis fr. 282 *PCG* with Arnott's note.

ANTIPHON
(*TrGF* 55)

Texts etc. *TrGF* 1^2.193–96 with *addenda* 1^2.352; *MusTr* 128–33, 286f.

Discussions. Hoffmann 1951, 156f. (chronology); Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 28–30.

The tragedian Antiphon is obviously a different person from the orator Antiphon of Rhamnous, who was executed after the failed oligarchic coup of 411 (cf. Agathon ***T 6*** *with note in Vol. 1), but their identities became confused so that some details of the tragedian's life became attached to biographies of the orator (****T 2****, T 3–6,* ***T 7****). The tragedian presumably went to Syracuse after Dionysius began to host poets and philosophers in the mid-380s (below, p. 175) and some time before the tyrant died in 367. He was probably not very young when he went to Sicily nor very old when Dionysius had him killed, therefore poetically active within the first three decades of the fourth century. The biographies of Antiphon of Rhamnous include an account of his death which must actually be about the tragedian: either he made fun of Dionysius's tragedies or (more plausibly) he caused Dionysius to suspect his involvement in a plot against him by alluding admiringly to the Athenian tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogeiton.*[1] *In the* Life *of the orator* (***T 3***) *this is said to have happened when Antiphon was an old man, but that is because the orator would have been an old man if he had still been living at the time. The text in [Plutarch],* Lives of the Ten Orators *(T 2) further confuses the issue by making him an ambassador (πρεσβευτής) rather than an old man (πρεσβύτης). That Dionysius had the tragedian put to death appears to be true, even if many other anecdotes about Dionysius are fictitious (below, pp. 172, 196), since Aristotle refers to the event in* ***T 1****. Ps.-Plutarch seems to suggest that Antiphon composed tragedies jointly with Dionysius (****T 7****), but this is probably a misleading abbreviation (see footnote to* ***T 7****).*

[1] The story of Antiphon's praise of the bronze used for the statues of the tyrannicides, ascribed to Antiphon in **T 3** and elsewhere, was also ascribed to Diogenes of Sinope (Diog. Laert. 6.50, with no context), and to Plato as causing his enslavement by Dionysius (Schol. Ael. Aristid. 200, 10.11ff., p. 624 Dindorf; Tzetzes, *Hist.* 5.23,138–47 and 10.359.855–61 declares that story false).

*What we know of the titles and content of Antiphon's tragedies comes entirely from Aristotle (**F 1**, **F 1b**, **F 2**, **F 4**). The brief fragments **[F 1a]**, **[F 5]**, **[F 6]** almost certainly do not belong to him (see footnote 12 below). It seems unlikely that texts of his plays were current after the fourth century or were read by Alexandrian and later scholars.*[2]

T 1 Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1385a1–13

καὶ μέλλοντες ὁρᾶσθαι καὶ ἐν φανερῷ ἀναστρέφεσθαι τοῖς συνειδόσιν αἰσχυντηλοὶ μᾶλλον εἰσίν· ὅθεν καὶ Ἀντιφῶν ὁ ποιητής, μέλλων ἀποτυμπανίζεσθαι ὑπὸ Διονυσίου, εἶπεν, ἰδὼν τοὺς συναποθνήσκειν μέλλοντας ἐγκαλυπτομένους ὡς ᾔεσαν διὰ τῶν πυλῶν, "τί ἐγκαλύπτεσθε;" ἔφη· "ἦ μὴ αὔριόν τις ὑμᾶς ἴδῃ τούτων;"

T 3 *Life of Antiphon of Rhamnous* 2.10 Thalheim (~ [Plutarch], *Moralia* 833b (= T 2), whence Photius, *Bibl*. cod. 259, p. 486a35–43 Bekker); cf. Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists* 1.15.3 (= T 4), Plut. *Mor.* 68a–b (= T 5), 1051c–d (= T 6).

φασὶ δέ ⟨τινες⟩ ἐν Σικελίᾳ αὐτὸν τελευτῆσαι παρὰ Διονυσίου· ἤδη γὰρ πρεσβύτης ὢν καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφικόμενος ἔσκωπτεν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Διονυσίου τὰς τραγῳδίας, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, φασίν, ἀχθεσθεὶς ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτόν. ἄλλοι δὲ λέγουσιν ὅτι οὐ διὰ τοῦτο, ἀλλ' ὑπωπτεύθη, φασί, καταλῦσαι θέλων τὴν τυραννίδα· ἐρωτηθέντα γάρ φασιν αὐτὸν παρὰ τοῦ Διονυσίου, ποῖος αὐτῷ χαλκὸς ἀρέσκει, εἰπεῖν, ὅθεν ἐγένοντο Ἁρμόδιος καὶ Ἀριστογείτων.

T 7 [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* 833c (~ Photius, *Bibl*. p. 486a15)

λέγεται δὲ τραγῳδίας συνθεῖναι καὶ ἰδίᾳ καὶ σὺν Διονυσίῳ τῷ τυράννῳ.

καὶ . . . Διονυσίῳ ps-Plut. ἰδίᾳ τε καὶ Διονυσίῳ συνδιατρίβοντα Phot.

---

[2] Snell prints with **F 1b** (cf. **T 8**) Athenaeus's mention of a work of Adrastus of Aphrodisias, a 2nd C. AD commentator on Aristotle, which included 'a wealth of ideas about Plexippus in the tragedian Antiphon and a great deal of information about Antiphon himself' (Ath. 15.673e–f). This means that Adrastus elucidated Aristotle's citations of Antiphon by explaining their mythological content and what was known about Antiphon's life, not that he had read any of the plays himself. The explanations of Aristotle's references to Antiphon's *Meleager* in an extant anonymous commentary on the *Rhetoric* simply paraphrase Aristotle (see *CAG* vol. 21.2, pp. 92, 31ff. and 141, 23ff., the latter cited by Snell on **T 2**).

T 1 Aristotle, *Rhetoric*

People are more inclined to feel shame when they are going to be seen by those who are aware of their disgrace and to go about openly before them. Hence Antiphon the poet, when he was about to be flogged to death by order of Dionysius and saw those who were going to die with him veiling their heads as they went through the gates, said, 'Why veil your heads? Are you afraid someone here might see you tomorrow?'

T 3 *Life of Antiphon of Rhamnous*[3]

(Some) say he died in Sicily at Dionysius's hands; for when he was already an old man and was visiting him he mocked Dionysius's tragedies, and for this reason, they say, Dionysius was angered and put him to death. Others say that it was not for this reason, but, they say, he was suspected of wanting to subvert the tyranny; for when he was asked by Dionysius what kind of bronze he found most pleasing he said, 'the kind from which Harmodius and Aristogeiton were made'.

T 7 [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators*

He is said to have composed tragedies both independently and with the tyrant Dionysius.[4]

[3] See above, p. 11.

[4] Photius's wording is probably more accurate: 'both independently and while residing with Dionysius'.

ΑΝΔΡΟΜΑΧΗ

*The title is not quite certain since Aristotle mentions 'Antiphon's Andromache' as a character (**F 1**), but she may well have been the play's central figure. **F 1** shows that in Antiphon's play Andromache gave up her son for adoption in order to allow him a prosperous life which she could observe while remaining unknown to him and receiving no reciprocal care from him (cf. Dicaeogenes **F 4** with note). Her decision was probably the focus of an emblematic scene.*

Aristotle does not explain the circumstances of Andromache's decision, nor the identity of her son. It is however unlikely to be Astyanax, her son by Hector who in the standard tradition was thrown to his death from the walls of Troy by the victorious Greeks. In the Latin Astyanax *of Accius (presumably based on a Greek source) Andromache tried vainly to hide Astyanax from the Greeks, a motif also found in Seneca's* Trojan Women *and in Servius's summary of the story.*[5] *But something of that kind would be an inept example of a mother giving up her son so as to watch him prosper with an adoptive family.*[6] *Antiphon's play, then, can hardly be the model for Accius's* Astyanax*, or for Ennius's* Andromacha *(also focused on her son's death) or the source of* TrGF ***adesp. F 644****, a papyrus fragment in which Andromache accompanied by Astyanax laments Hector's death (below, pp. 380–85).*[7]

---

[5] Accius, *Astyanax* frs IX–XI Ribbeck/Scafoglio (VIII–X Dangel), where it appears that Astyanax has been found hiding in the remote countryside. In Act 3 of Seneca's play Andromache tries to hide Astyanax in Hector's tomb but Ulysses discovers him. Servius on *Aeneid* 3.489: *hunc Ulixes occultatum a matre cum invenisset, praecipitat e muro* ('Ulysses found him (Astyanax) concealed by his mother and threw him from the wall').

[6] In some traditions Astyanax/Scamandrius survived the destruction of Troy and was later involved in the Trojans' resettlement of the Troad along with Aeneas's son Ascanius (»» Fowler 2013, 563 with note 135; Dionysius of Chalcis, *FGrHist* 1773 F 14 [Schol. Eur. *Andr.* 10] with D. Engels' commentary in *BNJ*). Andromache had no role in these events so far as we know.

[7] Morel 1937 linked Antiphon with **adesp. F 644** and Ennius, while Webster 1954, 299f. linked him with **adesp. F 644**, Accius and Servius: cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 41–44, Scafoglio 2006, 47f., 71. For the plot of Ennius's *Andromacha* see Jocelyn 1967, 234–38, Goldberg–Manuwald 2018, 28f.; for Accius's *Astyanax* Dangel 2002, 318–20, Scafoglio 67–73; and for both of these Fantham 1982, 63–68.

ANDROMACHE

A likelier context is Andromache's connection with Neoptolemus, who was supposed to have taken her as his concubine after the capture of Troy and settled with her in Epirus before his untimely death at Delphi. The basis for this was in the epic cycle (see Proclus's summaries of the Sack of Troy *and the* Returns*, arg. 4* GEF *in each case), but the story was repeatedly manipulated to suit the dynastic concerns of the rulers of Epirus and Macedonia in the fifth and fourth centuries, and of Pergamum in the third and second. In Euripides'* Andromache *the heroine is instructed after Neoptolemus's death to leave Phthia with Helenus (a Trojan survivor whom she will now marry) and settle in Epirus where her son by Neoptolemus is destined to rule the Molossians (*Andr. *1243–52). More commonly Neoptolemus himself settled in Epirus (sometimes guided by Helenus) and established the Molossian kingdom. In Pausanias's summary (1.11.1–2) Andromache bore him three sons, Molossus (eponym of the Molossians), Pielus (ancestor of the kings of Epirus) and Pergamus (who took Andromache back to Mysia and founded the city of Pergamum). An earlier tradition summarized in the scholia on Euripides'* Andromache *24 lists Pyrrhus (~ Pielus), Molossus and Aeacides (eponym of the late 4th-century king of Epirus), and adds that 'Aeacides was sent to safety by Andromache herself so that, if some harm should come to her sons because of Hermione's childlessness and her own powerlessness, they should not all be left vulnerable'.*[8] *Antiphon may well have visited the Molossian court before he went to Syracuse and provided a story of Andromache giving up one of her sons in order to secure his future — perhaps a variant of Euripides' plot (in which she vainly sends her son for safety to another household:* Andr. *47f. etc.) or the story of Aeacides mentioned above.*

[8] The scholia cite Proxenus who wrote on the history of Epirus in the early third century BC (*FGrH* 703), and the probably earlier *Macedonian History* of Nicomedes of Acanthus (*FGrH* 772), both as cited in the *Nostoi* of Lysimachus of Alexandria (end of 3rd C. BC or later: *FGrH* 382 F 10a–b).

F 1 Aristotle *Eth.Eudem.* 1239a33–40

ἔστι δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν φιλίαν τὸ φιλεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ φιλεῖσθαι, τὸ δὲ φιλεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸ φιλητόν. σημεῖον δέ· ἕλοιτ' ἂν ὁ φίλος μᾶλλον, εἰ μὴ ἐνδέχοιτ' ἄμφω, γιγνώσκειν ἢ γιγνώσκεσθαι, οἷον ἐν ταῖς ὑποβολαῖς αἱ γυναῖκες ποιοῦσι, καὶ ἡ Ἀνδρομάχη ἡ Ἀντιφῶντος.

— *Eth.Nic.* 1159a27–33: δοκεῖ δ' ἐν τῷ φιλεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν τῷ φιλεῖσθαι εἶναι. σημεῖον δ' αἱ μητέρες τῷ φιλεῖν χαίρουσαι· ἔνιαι γὰρ διδόασι τὰ ἑαυτῶν τρέφεσθαι, καὶ φιλοῦσι μὲν εἰδυῖαι, ἀντιφιλεῖσθαι δ' οὐ ζητοῦσιν, ἐὰν ἀμφότερα μὴ ἐνδέχηται, ἀλλ' ἱκανὸν αὐταῖς ἔοικεν εἶναι ἐὰν ὁρῶσιν εὖ πράττοντας, καὶ αὐταὶ φιλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς κἂν ἐκεῖνοι μηδὲν ὦν μητρὶ προσήκει ἀπονέμωσι διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν.

ΜΕΛΕΑΓΡΟΣ

Grossardt 2001, 96–100.

Plexippus was one of the sons of Thestius who took part in the hunting of the Calydonian Boar and were killed by Meleager in a conflict over the award of the boar's head, tusks and hide. He is named as one of the sons in late mythographic summaries (where they number up to five) and in Ovid's Metamorphoses *(Plexippus and Toxeus,* Met. *8.42ff.), but not in the early poetic accounts of Stesichorus (*Boar-hunters *F 183.3f.) and Bacchylides (*Odes *5.128f.).*[9] *The name's first known appearance is in fact in Antiphon, although it might have been used by Euripides or in earlier genealogies (»» Grossardt 2002, 90). Aristotle's use of* ***F 2*** *as a rhetorical example suggests that this was a criticism of Meleager's conduct ('Were we brought here merely to witness Meleager's prowess?') made by Plexippus in a debate-speech.*[10] ***F 1b*** *may refer to the same scene, Plexippus complaining that Meleager has slighted him by ignoring their kinship (a bond of* philia*, Aristotle's subject)*[11] *and his right to a share in the spoils of the hunt. That Meleager provoked the quarrel by*

[9] Davies and Finglass (2014, 515–22, 525f.) provide a thorough survey of the poetic tradition and a complete list of the names given in the sources.

[10] There is not much to be said for placing **F 2** in the play's prologue (Meineke 1839, 315; Grossardt 2001, 97) or in a messenger-speech (Welcker 1841, 1042f.; Grossardt *ibid.*), nor for Welcker's opinion that Plexippus did not appear as a character in the play.

[11] In Diodorus 4.34.4 and ps.-Apollodorus 1.8.2 the Thestiads complain specifically that Meleager has spurned their kinship with him.

F 1 Aristotle*, Eudemian Ethics*

Giving love is more a function of love than being loved, while being loved is more a function of being a loved one. A sign of this is that someone who loves would choose to know rather than be known if both were not possible, as women do in giving up their children for adoption, and as Antiphon's Andromache does.

— *Nicomachean Ethics*: It (i.e. love) seems to consist in giving love rather than in being loved. A sign of this is women who are happy giving love. Some give up their own children to be raised (i.e. by others), and know and love them but do not seek to be loved in return if both are not possible. It seems to be enough for them if they see their children prospering, and they love them even if the children give their mother none of the returns that she ought to receive, because they are unaware of her.

MELEAGER

awarding the prize to Atalanta is likely, this being the dominant version of the story after Euripides' late Meleager*. Antiphon's play presumably included the killing of Plexippus and his brother(s) and Meleager's own death caused by his mother (their sister) Althaea when she burned the brand on which his life depended (cf. Phrynichus* ***F 6*** *n. in Vol. 1).*

*Meleager was a standard tragic subject according to Aristotle (*Poetics *1453a18–22). Plays by Sophocles, Euripides and Sosiphanes (below, pp. 234f.) are known, as well as some unattributed fragments which are or might be from such plays: adesp. F 80 (from Aristotle's* Rhetoric*, an argument about the proper occasions for gratitude), adesp. F 81 (again from Aristotle, Oeneus's grief for Meleager compared with Thestius's for his sons), adesp. F 188 (prized by rhetoricians for its ambiguity, either 'O Zeus, may it happen that I kill the boar' or 'O Zeus, may it come about that the boar kills me'), adesp. F 625 (papyrus mentioning funeral honours for Meleager), adesp. F 632 (papyrus: 37 very incomplete lines mentioning the boars' hide and Atalanta). None of these can be attributed to Antiphon's play with any confidence. Grossardt argues for F 81 and F 625, while F 188 and the papyrus fragments have been considered for Euripides. Fourth-century vase-paintings showing Meleager with Atalanta probably reflect the Euripidean play, while an Apulian vase showing the death of Meleager might be related to Euripides or Antiphon or neither (»» Collard–Cropp 2008a, 617. Grossardt 2001, 98f., 237 links the Apulian vase with Antiphon, Taplin 2007, 196–98 uncertainly with Euripides).*

F 1b Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1379b13–17

τοῖς δὲ φίλοις (*sc.* ὀργίζονται) ἐάν τε μὴ εὖ λέγωσιν ἢ ποιῶσιν, καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐὰν τἀναντία, καὶ ἐὰν μὴ αἰσθάνωνται δεομένων, ὥσπερ ὁ Ἀντιφῶντος Πλήξιππος τῷ Μελεάγρῳ· ὀλιγωρίας γὰρ τὸ μὴ αἰσθάνεσθαι σημεῖον· ὧν γὰρ φροντίζομεν οὐ λανθάνει.

F 2 Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1399b20–28

ἄλλος τὸ οὗ ἕνεκ’ ἂν εἴη ἢ γένοιτο, τούτου ἕνεκα φάναι εἶναι ἢ γεγενῆσθαι, οἷον εἰ δοίη ἂν τίς τινι ἵν’ ἀφελόμενος λυπήσῃ, ὅθεν καὶ τοῦτ’ εἴρηται . . . καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Μελεάγρου τοῦ Ἀντιφῶντος,

οὐχ ὡς κτάνωσι θῆρ’, ὅπως δὲ μάρτυρες
ἀρετῆς γένωνται Μελεάγρῳ πρὸς Ἑλλάδα,

καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Αἴαντος Θεοδέκτου . . .

v. 1 ὡς Gaisford ἵνα (unmetrical) mss. ἵνα κάνωσι Dobree

INCERTA FABULA

F 4 [Aristotle], *Mechanics* 847a16–21

ὅταν οὖν δέῃ τι παρὰ φύσιν πρᾶξαι, διὰ τὸ χαλεπὸν ἀπορίαν παρέχει καὶ δεῖται τέχνης. διὸ καὶ καλοῦμεν τῆς τέχνης τὸ πρὸς τὰς τοιαύτας ἀπορίας βοηθοῦν μέρος μηχανήν. καθάπερ γὰρ ἐποίησεν Ἀντιφῶν ὁ ποιητής, οὕτω καὶ ἔχει·

τέχνῃ γὰρ κρατοῦμεν ὧν φύσει νικώμεθα.

Brief and doubtful fragments:[12] **F 1a?** διετίθουν, **[F 5]** αὐτόφυτον, **[F 6]** ἀκοινώνητα

[12] **F 1a** is attributed to ‘Antiphon in *Jason*’ in the Antiatticist lexicon (δ 41 Valente) but probably belongs to the comic playwright Antiphanes, who is cited frequently in lexica (24 times in the Antiatticist lexicon) and whose name was sometimes corrupted as ‘Antiphon’ (»» Meineke 1839, 314–17; *PCG* II, 313). **[F 5]** and **[F 6]** are attributed to ‘Antiphon’ in Photius’s lexicon and very probably belong to the orator who is cited there more than 50 times.

F 1b Aristotle, *Rhetoric*

People feel anger at their friends if their friends do not speak well of them or treat them well, and even more so if they do the opposite; also if they do not notice when they want something, as Antiphon's Plexippus felt anger at Meleager. For not noticing is a sign of contempt: we do not fail to notice the needs of people we care about.

F 2 Aristotle, *Rhetoric*

Another (type of argument) is to claim that what might be a reason for something being the case or happening actually is the reason for its being the case or having happened, for example if someone were to give someone a gift in order to hurt him by taking it away: hence the following has been said . . . *(*TrGF *adesp. F 82)* . . . and this from Antiphon's *Meleager*:

> Not in order to kill the boar, but to be witnesses to Hellas of Meleager's prowess,

and this from Theodectas's *Ajax* . . . (*Theodectas* ***F 1***) . . .

UNIDENTIFIED PLAY

F 4 [Aristotle], *Mechanics*

So when we have to get something done that cannot be done naturally, it perplexes us because of its difficulty and requires art *(technê).* We call the element of art that assists us with such difficulties a device *(mêchanê)*. It is as Antiphon the poet put it:

> By art we master things that naturally defeat us.[13]

Brief and doubtful fragments: **F 1a** (*Jason*?) they were arranging, **[F 5]** growing spontaneously, **[F 6]** unshared

[13] Cf. Agathon **F 6** and **F 8**, both cited by Aristotle defining *technê*.

PATROCLES OF THURII
(*TrGF* 58)

Texts etc. *TrGF* 1[2].197 with *addendum* 5.1109; *MusTr* 132–35 (**F 1**).

Discussions. Cropp–Storey 2018 (testimonia); Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 30.

Snell listed two tragedians named Patrocles, TrGF *57 Patrocles of Athens and 58 Patrocles of Thurii, following Hoffmann 1951, 158 but adding that they might be the same person. The only evidence for a tragedian Patrocles of Athens is in the scholia on Aristophanes'* Wealth *84 (Snell's T 1a), where the blind and decrepit Wealth says that he is coming 'from the house of Patrocles, who hasn't washed since he was*

INCERTAE FABULAE

F 1 Stobaeus 4.47.3

Πατροκλέους·

καὶ νῦν τὰ δεινὰ ταῦτα καὶ τὰ πόλλ' ἔπη
εἰς ὧδε μικρὸν τεῦχος ἤθροισεν τύχη.
τί δῆτα θνητοὶ πόλλ' ἀπειλοῦμεν μάτην
δεινοὺς ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι πέμποντες λόγους,
καὶ πάντα συννοοῦμεν ἐκπράξειν χερί,
πρόσω βλέποντες, τὴν δὲ πλησίον τύχην
οὐκ ἴσμεν οὐδ' ὁρῶμεν ἀθλίου μόρου;

5 συννοούμεθ' Wecklein

F 2 Clement Alex., *Protrepticus* 2.30.4–6

Πατροκλῆς τε ὁ Θούριος καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ὁ νεώτερος ἐν τρισὶ τραγῳδίαις ἱστορεῖτον τοῖν Διοσκούροιν πέρι· ἀνθρώπω τινὲ τούτω τὼ Διοσκούρω ἐπικήρω ἐγενέσθην . . .

1 ἔν τισι Welcker

born'. The scholia (T 1b) explain that Patrocles was a notorious miser, and a note in the Venice manuscript V (11th C.) adds, 'he was a tragic poet'. This is clearly a mistake, and Aristophanes' Patrocles is irrelevant (»» Cropp–Storey 2018). ***F 1*** *is best assigned to Patrocles of Thurii along with* ***F 2*** *as was routinely done before Hoffmann. Nothing places him in the early fourth century.*[1]

UNIDENTIFIED PLAYS

F 1 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On unexpected outcomes'

Patrocles:

> And now these many grim pronouncements are gathered by fortune into this small urn. Why then do we mortals voice many a vain threat, launching fearsome words against each other, and think we will fulfil them all in action,[5] looking ahead, but do not know nor see the outcome of piteous death that awaits nearby?

F 2 Clement of Alexandria, *Exhortation to the Hellenes*

Patrocles of Thurii and the younger Sophocles tell of the Dioscuri in three (*or* 'in certain'?) tragedies. These Disocuri were humans subject to death . . . *(Clement goes on to quote* Iliad *3.243f. and* Cypria *fr. 9* GEF*).*

[1] Hoffmann 159 n. 1 suggested restoring]ῃς as Πατροκλ]ῆς in the Athenian Victors List for the Lenaea c. 380 BC (DID A 3b, 37, Snell's T 2), but that depended on the identification with Aristophanes' Patrocles. For theatre at Thurii in the 5th and 4th centuries see Csapo–Wilson 2015, 340f., *SEHT* II.287f.

Notes on Patrocles

F 1

The speaker laments someone who has met his death acting recklessly on **vain threats**, and whose ashes are contained in **this small urn**.[2] In a striking synecdoche the threats themselves are consigned to the urn. The scenario recalls the celebrated scene in Sophocles' *Electra* (1098ff.) where Electra receives from her brother Orestes the urn supposedly containing his ashes. (On the fame of Sophocles' play and this scene in particular in antiquity see Finglass 2017, 478–88.) Stephanopoulos 1988b, 4f. notes many examples of familiar tragic phrasing and ideas, e.g. **these many grim pronouncements** (~ Soph. *Aj.* 669, 1107, *OT* 512), **this small urn** (~ Soph. *El.* 757f., 1113f., 1119f., 1142), **Why then do we mortals . . .** (~ Eur. *Hec.* 814f., *Supp*. 734ff., F 111, F 795, Sosiphanes **F 3**.1f.), **many a vain threat . . . fearsome words** (~ Aesch. *Sept.* 426, Soph.. *Ant*. 408, *El.* 779, Eur. *Supp.* 542), mortals' arrogant blindness to approaching death (~ Hom. *Od.* 2.281–84, Sosiphanes **F 3**.5–6, adesp. F 127.4). For the corpse reduced to 'a little handful of dust' cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 437–44, Eur. *Suppl.* 1129f. etc. (»» Stephanopoulos 2013, 67).

F 2

Clement (drawing on an Epicurean source: »» Henrichs 1975, 10–12) asserts that the gods traditionally worshipped by the Greeks were in fact humans who led mortal lives and died mortal deaths. The Dioscuri were generally regarded as divine or semi-divine, but in most accounts at least one of them died. In *Iliad* 3.236ff. both are recently dead and buried. The plays of Patrocles and Sophocles II (*TrGF* 62: below, pp. 54–59) presumably dealt with events leading to their deaths, for which see on Critias(?) **F 15–18** (*Rhadamanthys*) in Vol. 1. A *Castor and Polydeuces* by Timesitheus (*TrGF* no. 214, date unknown) is known only from a list of that tragedian's titles (Suda *τ* 613).

[2] I do not see any sign of the 'obvious Schadenfreude' and 'gleeful relief' observed in Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 30. The urn would hardly be in the hands of one of the dead man's enemies.

ASTYDAMAS I
(*TrGF* 59)

Texts etc. TrGF 1[2].198. *Chronology.* Hoffmann 1951, 163–9.

The evidence for Astydamas I is given here in order to distinguish him from his more famous son, Astydamas II. He was a grandson of Aeschylus's nephew Philocles (Philocles I in Vol. 1). The Suda (α 4264 = ***T 1****) provides basic information:*

> Ἀστυδάμας, ὁ πρεσβύτης, υἱὸς Μορσίμου τοῦ Φιλοκλέους, τραγικῶν ἀμφοτέρων, Ἀθηναῖος, τραγικός.
>
> Astydamas, the elder, son of Morsimus son of Philocles (both of them tragedians), Athenian, tragedian.

A second sentence giving numbers of productions and victories and stating that he was a pupil of Isocrates is misplaced in this entry and must refer to his son (see Astydamas II ***T 1****) as Isocrates started teaching rhetoric in the late 390s. Some further information is however given by Diodorus (14.43.5 =* ***T 2****):*

> Ἀστυδάμας δ' ὁ τραγῳδιογράφος τότε πρῶτον ἐδίδαξεν· ἔζησε δὲ ἔτη ἑξήκοντα.
>
> At that time (i.e. the year 399/8) Astydamas the tragic playwright directed his first production. He lived sixty years.

This dating of the first production presumably comes from a didascalic record and must relate to Astydamas I, although Diodorus was probably thinking of his son whose first Dionysia victory was actually in 372.[1] *Sources referring simply to 'Astydamas' usually mean the younger poet.*

[1] *TrGF* misleadingly numbers Astydamas II (no. 60) and his brother Philocles II (no. 61) before Sophocles II (no. 62) who was their father's contemporary. Nothing is known of Philocles II's career, unless he is the]κλης who came second at the Dionysia in 340 and first in 329 (more probably Timocles: see *TrGF* 86 T3?, T 5?, Millis–Olson pp. 48, 58, 65, 68).

ASTYDAMAS II
(*TrGF* 60)

Texts etc. TrGF 1[2].198–207 with *addenda* 1[2].352f., 5.1109; *MusTr* 134–45, 287f.

Discussions. Hoffmann 1951, 163–74 (chronology); Wright 2016a, 101–5; Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 30–38. See further below on *Alcmeon, Antigone, Hector*.

Satyr-plays (Hermes F 3*, Heracles* F 4). *GrSat* 566–79; Cipolla 2003, 275f.; 286–89, 303–6; O'Sullivan–Collard 2013, 508.

For the family details see under Astydamas I. Fragmentary didascalic records (T 3–7) show that Astydamas II won his first Dionysia victory in 372, a first Lenaea victory about 370, and further Dionysia victories in 347, 341 (with Achilles*,* Athamas *and* Antigone*) and 340 (with* Parthenopaeus *and* Lycaon*). The Suda's number of fifteen victories (**T 1**) is compatible with the damaged entries in the Victors List (Dionysia 7, 8 or 9 victories, Lenaea number lost).*[1] *Its exaggerated total of 240 tragedies may be due to faulty textual transmission or inclusion of his father's plays, or both.*

T 1 Suda *α* 4265

Ἀστυδάμας, ὁ νέος, υἱὸς τοῦ προτέρου, τραγικὸς καὶ αὐτός. δράματα αὐτοῦ Ἡρακλῆς Σατυρικὸς, Ἐπίγονοι, Αἴας μαινόμενος, Βελλεροφόντης, Τυρώ, Ἀλκμήνη, Φοῖνιξ, Παλαμήδης. ⟨ἔγραψε τραγῳδίας σμ΄, ἐνίκησε ιε΄. ἀκροασάμενος δὲ ἦν Ἰσοκράτους καὶ ἐτράπη ἐπὶ τραγῳδίαν.⟩

ἔγραψε . . . τραγῳδίαν misplaced in Sud. *α* 4264

[1] Dionysia: *IG* II[2] 2325.44 and 240, Millis–Olson pp. 145 and 205 (= *TrGF* DID A 3a.44 and 3b.42).

*Of the seventeen known titles eight come from the Suda (**T 1**), five from didascalic records (above), and four from other sources (*Alcmeon*,* Hector*,* Hermes*,* Nauplius*).*[2] *There are surprisingly no overlaps between these groups except that the satyric* Heracles *listed in the Suda was quoted by Athenaeus (F 4) and the tragedy* Parthenopaeus *listed in the Didascaliae was remembered in the anecdotal tradition (**T 2a**).*[3] *Plutarch implies that the* Hector *was especially famous, but there is only one brief book-fragment (**F 2**) and what we know or conjecture about it comes mostly from papyrus finds.*[4] *The book-fragments as a whole are confined to Athenaeus (**F 3**, **4**, **6**), Stobaeus (**F 1c**, **5**, 7, **8**) the scholia on the* Iliad *(**F 2**) and on* Oedipus Coloneus *(**F 9**) and the observations of Aristotle (**F 1b**) and Plutarch (**F 1(h)**).*

*The evidence shows nevertheless that Astydamas was a leading figure in the Athenian theatre of the mid-fourth century. The tradition about the dedication of his statue in the Theatre of Dionysus is at least partly fictitious (see below on **T 2a** with **T 8a–b**), but the fact remains that the statue was dedicated and put him in the élite company of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and Menander.*

T 1 Suda

Astydamas, the younger, son of the preceding (*α* 4264 = Astydamas I **T 1**), himself also a tragedian. His plays: *Heracles (satyric), Epigoni, Mad Ajax, Bellerophon, Tyro, Alcmene, Phoenix, Palamedes.* ⟨He wrote 240 tragedies, and won 15 victories. He studied with Isocrates and turned to tragedy⟩.

---

[2] The satyric *Hermes* was probably performed in Athens in 254 BC (*SEG* 26.208, *TrGF* DID A 4a), although the poet's name is now missing from the inscription.

[3] The *Parthenopaeus* might have been about his death with the Seven at Thebes, but an Apulian vase with what looks like a tragic scene in which he contemplates joining their campaign is dated at least a decade before the play's production (Taplin 2007, 224f. no. 85). The story of his reunion with his mother Atalanta after his exposure at birth is unlikely to be relevant (see below, p. 397 with n. 5).

[4] The papyrus fragments in P. Hibeh 3 (*TrGF* adesp. F 626) are not likely to be from Astydamas's *Tyro* (nor from Carcinus's *Tyro*, cf. below, p. 79).

T 2

(a) Pausanias Att. *σ* 6 Erbse (inferred from Photius *σ* 101 Theodoridis, Suda *σ* 161 whence Apostolius 15.36). The proverb was widely used (»» Bühler 1999, 420f.).

σαυτὴν ἐπαινεῖς, ὥσπερ Ἀστυδάμας ποτέ· Ἀστυδάμαντι τῷ Μορσίμου εὐημερήσαντι ἐπὶ τραγῳδίας διδασκαλίᾳ Παρθενοπαίου, δοθῆναι ὑπ᾽ Ἀθηναίων εἰκόνος ἀνάθεσιν ἐν θεάτρῳ. τὸν δὲ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπίγραμμα ποιῆσαι ἀλαζονικὸν τοῦτο·

εἴθ᾽ ἐγὼ ἐν κείνοις γενόμην, ἢ κεῖνοι ἅμ᾽ ἡμῖν,
οἳ γλώσσης τερπνῆς πρῶτα δοκοῦσι φέρειν,
ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας ἐκρίθην ἀφεθεὶς παράμιλλος·
νῦν δὲ χρόνῳ προέχουσ᾽, ᾧ φθόνος οὐχ ἕπεται.

διὰ γοῦν τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἀλαζονείαν ⟨ἐκείνους⟩ παραιτήσασθαι τὴν ἐπιγραφήν. καὶ παροιμία παρὰ τοῖς κωμικοῖς ἐγένετο, ὡς παρὰ Φιλήμονι. λέγεται δὲ καὶ κατὰ ἀποκοπὴν τὸ *σαυτὴν ἐπαίνεις*.

1 *ποτε* Phot., Sud. etc. *γύναι* Zenob. 7 *προέχουσ᾽* Apostolius ms. R (*προσ-* others), conj. Bentley *προσέχουσαις* Phot. *παρέχουσ᾽* Sud. *ᾧ* Bentley, Page *οἷς* Phot., Sud.

(b) Zenobius 5.100

σαυτὴν ἐπαινεῖς· αὕτη τῶν κατ᾽ ἔλλειψιν λεγομένων ἐστί· τὸ δὲ πλῆρες ἔχει οὕτως· *σαυτὴν ἐπαινεῖς, ὥσπερ Ἀστυδάμας, γύναι.* Ἀστυδάμας γὰρ ὁ Μορσίμου εὐημερήσας ἐν τῇ ὑποκρίσει Παρθενοπαίου ἐψηφίσθη εἰκόνος ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ ἀξιωθῆναι. γράψας οὖν αὐτὸς ἐπίγραμμα ὁ Ἀστυδάμας ἔπαινον ἑαυτοῦ ἔχον ἀνήνεγκεν ἐπὶ τὴν βούλην· οἱ δὲ ἐψηφίσαντο ὡς ἐπαχθὲς αὐτὸ μηκέτι ἐπιγραφῆναι. διὸ καὶ σκώπτοντες αὐτὸν οἱ ποιηταὶ ἔλεγον· *σαυτὴν ἐπαινεῖς, ὥσπερ Ἀστυδάμας, γύναι.*

T 3–7 *are didascalic records: see above, p. 24.*

T 8

(a) Diogenes Laertius 2.43 (Heraclides Ponticus fr. 169 Wehrli, 98 Schütrumpf)

οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐπὶ Σωκράτους Ἀθηναῖοι πεπόνθασι τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ πλείστων ὅσων. καὶ γὰρ Ὅμηρον, καθά φησιν Ἡρακλείδης, πεντήκοντα δραχμαῖς ὡς μαινόμενον ἐζημίωσαν, καὶ Τυρταῖον παρακόπτειν ἔλεγον, καὶ Ἀστυδάμαντα πρότερον τῶν περὶ Αἰσχύλον ἐτίμησαν εἰκόνι χαλκῇ.

ἐζημίωσαν Cobet ἐτίμησαν Diog. πρότερον Hermann πρῶτον Diog.

(b) IG II^2 3775, fragment of a marble statue base in the Theatre of Dionysus

Ἀστυδ̣[

T 2

(a) Pausanias, *Attic Lexicon*

You praise yourself as Astydamas did once: Astydamas son of Morsimus had a success with the production of his *Parthenopaeus* (340 BC) and was permitted by the Athenians to set up a statue in the theatre. He then composed this boastful epigram for himself:

> *Would that I had lived in their times, or they in mine,*
> *Who are deemed to hold first place in beguiling speech,*
> *So I had started with them and been truly judged:*
> *But now they are ahead in time, with which envy does not keep pace.*

So because of this excessive boastfulness they rejected the inscription. And he became a byword with the comic poets such as Philemon. It is also said in abbreviated form, *You praise yourself*.

(b) Zenobius, *Proverbs*

You praise yourself: this is one of those that are abbreviated; the full form is, *You praise yourself, woman, as Astydamas does*. Astydamas son of Morsimus had a success in the performance of *Parthenopaeus* and was decreed to be worthy of a statue in the theatre. So Astydamas himself wrote an inscription containing praise of himself and submitted it to the Council. But they decreed that it was offensive and should no longer be inscribed. Because of this the poets mocked him and said, *You praise yourself, woman, as Astydamas does*.

T 3–7 *See opposite.*

T 8

(a) Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers, Socrates*

Not only in the case of Socrates (i.e. his condemnation) have the Athenians suffered this (i.e. this kind of misjudgment), but of very many others as well. They also fined Homer fifty drachmas as being mad, according to Heraclides, and claimed that Tyrtaeus was out of his mind, and honoured Astydamas with a bronze statue before Aeschylus and company.

(b) IG II^2 3775, fragment of a marble statue base in the Theatre of Dionysus

Astyd[amas

T 9 P. Petrie 2.49(b) (see Aristarchus **F 1a**, Vol. 1), col. 1.15–19

ἐπὶ Ἕκτορος τοῦ Ἀσ]τυδάμαντος·
]ειδο . . . ὅστις ἐκείνου
] . αι Ἰ̣λιάδι
]τρεσαν ὃν περὶ πάτρης
]γα̣ . . . π᾽ ἐμός.

1 suppl. Reitzenstein, Maltomini (2001) 2]ἀ̣είδομαι? ed. pr., Maltomini 3]μ̣αι probable: Maltomini

ΑΛΚΜΕΩΝ

Webster 1954, 305; Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 38–41; Zouganeli 2017, 75–77.

*Alcmeon's mother Eriphyle betrayed her husband Amphiaraus, sending him to his death in the failed expedition of the Seven against Thebes. On reaching manhood Alcmeon joined the other sons of the Seven (the Epigoni) in their successful attack on Thebes and later avenged his father by killing Eriphyle. He then suffered madness and persecution by the Erinyes, and a series of tribulations ended with his death (»» Gantz 1993, 522–27). Aristotle includes Alcmeon with Oedipus, Orestes, Meleager, Thyestes and Telephus in a shortlist of heroes whose 'great errors' (*hamartiai megalai*) put them amongst the commonest and best subjects for tragedies (*Poetics *1453a17–22). The fourth-century comic playwright Antiphanes cited Alcmeon as an example of how tragedians could rely on their tradition-based plots being easily understood.*[5]

Many tragedies about these events are known. Sophocles' Eriphyle *probably treated the seduction of Eriphyle and her betrayal of Amphiaraus, and his* Epigoni *certainly treated the matricide and its immediate aftermath; similarly Accius's Latin* Eriphyla *and* Epigoni.[6] *Several plays*

[5] Antiphanes fr. 189.8ff. *PCG*, ἂν πάλιν | εἴπῃ τις Ἀλκμέωνα, καὶ τὰ παιδία | πάντ᾽ εὐθὺς εἴρηχ᾽, ὅτι μανεὶς ἀπέκτονεν | τὴν μητέρ᾽, ἀγανακτῶν δ᾽ Ἄδραστος εὐθέως | ἥξει πάλιν τ᾽ ἄπεισι . . . : 'Or if someone says 'Alcmeon', even the children have recited the whole lot right away, that he's gone mad and killed his mother, and Adrastus will promptly arrive complaining, then leave again . . . '. A fragment ascribed to Sophocles' *Epigoni* (F **187 *TrGF*) has Eriphyle's brother Adrastus, leader of the Seven against Thebes, blaming Alcmeon for the murder.

[6] In both cases some scholars have thought that these were alternative titles of a single play.

T 9 Petrie papyrus
(On the Hector*?) of (As)*tydamas:

. . . . . *(I?)* sing, who . . . . . of that (*man?*) . . . . . of Ilion . . . . . they *feared*, whom . . . . . for his fatherland . . . . . my . . . . . .

ALCMEON

named Alcmeon *or* Alphesiboea *dealt with the later events.*[7] *The plots of Agathon's* Alcmeon*, the* Alcmeon*s of Timotheus (*TrGF *56*) *and Euaretus (*TrGF *85) and the* Eriphyle *and* Alcmeon *attributed to Nicomachus of Alexandria Troas (below, pp. 306–9) are unknown, but it is possible that all the plays named* Alcmeon *handled the later events. If so, the play of Astydamas discussed by Aristotle in* ***F 1b*** *would probably be his* Epigoni*, a play otherwise known only as a title in the Suda's list (****T 1****), and only Stobaeus's verse* ***F 1c*** *would represent his* Alcmeon.[8]

In one of these plays, then, Astydamas parted from the tradition by making Alcmeon kill his mother in ignorance and recognize their relationship only later, and Aristotle preferred this as it made the killing less morally repugnant. Webster inferred that Alcmeon failed to recognize his mother because he had been maddened by his father's demand for vengeance,[9] *and that Antiphanes' comment about the myth referred to Astydamas's plot.*[10] *This is questionable (cf. Stephanopoulos 1984, 181f.): Aristotle was talking about killings committed in ignorance of a close relationship, not in madness (his other examples have nothing to do with madness), and Antiphanes' remark concerns myths that were*

---

[7] Sophocles' *Alcmeon*, Euripides' *Alcmeon in Psophis* and *Alcmeon in Corinth*, Theodectas's *Alcmeon* (below, pp. 136–39), Achaeus's satyric *Alcmeon*, and in Latin Ennius's *Alcmeo* and Accius's *Alcmeo*. *Alphesiboea*s: Achaeus (Vol. 1, pp. 107f.), Timotheus, Chaeremon (below, pp. 97f.) and in Latin Accius.

[8] Welcker' suggestion (1841, 1058) that the Suda's *Epigoni* and Stobaeus's *Alcmeon* might have been the same play is unneeded.

[9] Or rather by his father's Erinyes (cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 284–90)?

[10] Cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 39; Zouganeli 2017, 76f.

instantly recognizable, whereas Aristotle implies that Astydamas departed from the tradition. But it is not easy to imagine a context in which a sane Alcmeon might have killed his mother unknowingly.

Alcmeon's recognition of his error must have taken place in a climactic scene ('within the tragedy', Aristotle), perhaps confronting the dying Eriphyle or her corpse (Snell in TrGF*).*

F 1b Aristotle, *Poetics* 1453b29–34

τοὺς μὲν οὖν παρειλημμένους μύθους λύειν οὐκ ἔστιν, λέγω δὲ οἷον τὴν Κλυταιμήστραν ἀποθανοῦσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὀρέστου καὶ τὴν Ἐριφύλην ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀλκμέωνος, αὐτὸν δὲ εὑρίσκειν δεῖ καὶ τοῖς παραδεδομένοις χρῆσθαι καλῶς. τὸ δὲ καλῶς τί λέγομεν, εἴπωμεν σαφέστερον. ἔστι μὲν γὰρ οὕτω γίνεσθαι τὴν πρᾶξιν, ὥσπερ οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐποίουν εἰδότας καὶ γιγνώσκοντας, καθάπερ καὶ Εὐριπίδης ἐποίησεν ἀποκτείνουσαν τοὺς παῖδας τὴν Μήδειαν· ἔστιν δὲ πρᾶξαι μέν, ἀγνοοῦντας δὲ πρᾶξαι τὸ δεινόν, εἶθ' ὕστερον ἀναγνωρίσαι τὴν φιλίαν, ὥσπερ ὁ Σοφοκλέους Οἰδίπους· τοῦτο μὲν οὖν ἔξω τοῦ δράματος, ἐν δ' αὐτῇ τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ οἷον ὁ Ἀλκμέων ὁ Ἀστυδάμαντος ἢ ὁ Τηλέγονος ὁ ἐν τῷ τραυματίᾳ Ὀδυσσεῖ . . .

F 1c Stobaeus 2.15.1

Ἀστυδάμαντος Ἀλκμαίωνος·

οὐ τοῦ δοκεῖν μοι, τῆς δ' ἀληθείας μέλει.

ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΗ

TrGF 5.1.262f. (with possible testimonia and bibliography). Webster 1954, 304f.; Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 47–51, 55–58; Zimmermann 1993, 171–78, 182f., 217–22; Karamanou 2019, 15–18; Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 36.

Vases: Paton 1901; Séchan 1927, 277–90; Taplin 2007, 185f.

The play is known only as a title in the Didascaliae inscription (DID A 2a, 6 = T 5), which records that Astydamas won the prize at the Dionysia of 341 with Achilles*,* Athamas *and* Antigone*. This is the only known Greek* Antigone *after those of Sophocles and Euripides (Accius's Latin* Antigona *seems to have been based largely on Sophocles). In Sophocles' play Antigone defies her uncle Creon to give burial to her brother, the traitor Polynices, after the failed attack of the Seven against Thebes; Creon condemns her to death, and this leads to her suicide in the cave where Creon has had her immured, and to the suicides of Cre-*

F 1b Aristotle, *Poetics*

Now it is not possible to undo the traditional stories — I mean, for example, Clytemnestra killed by Orestes, or Eriphyle by Alcmeon — but one must be inventive and use the traditional data well. Let us state more clearly what we mean by 'well'. It is possible for the action to come about as in the early tragedians' practice, with people knowing and understanding (what they are doing), just as Euripides too portrayed Medea killing her children. It is possible also for people to do the dreadful deed but do it in ignorance and recognize their close relationship (*philia*) with the victim later, as Sophocles' Oedipus does. His crime of course is outside the drama, but others do it within the tragedy itself, for example Astydamas's Alcmeon or Telegonus in *Odysseus Wounded* . . .

F 1c Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On seeming and being, etc.'

From Astydamas's *Alcmaeon*:

I care not for seeming but for truth.

ANTIGONE

on's son Haemon (her fiancé) and his wife Eurydice. According to the hypotheses and scholia on Sophocles' play, Euripides' Antigone *was similar except that Haemon helped Antigone with the burial, both were arrested, she was spared and given to him in marriage, and they had a son Maeon. The two dozen fragments of Euripides' play are largely uninformative but include references to the powers of love (*erôs*), persuasion (*peithô*) and Dionysus, the last suggesting that the god appeared as* deus ex machina *to save the endangered couple (»» Collard–Cropp 2008a, 156ff.).*

Evidence for Astydamas's plot has been sought in two sources:

(1) Hyginus, *Fab*. 72 'Antigona' consists mainly of what was clearly a tragic plot though conflated with other mythographic data. In the back-story (no doubt told in a prologue), Antigone's crime was discovered and Creon

instructed Haemon to put her to death, but Haemon sent her secretly to the country where she bore a son. In the play itself the son, now grown up, comes to Thebes to compete in some games but Creon recognizes him by the birthmark which all the Theban Spartoi share[11] and again condemns Antigone to death, rejecting an intervention by Heracles; Haemon then kills both Antigone and himself. This plot, set long after the events surrounding the burial of Polynices, cannot be identified with Euripides' *Antigone*[12] and might be connected directly or indirectly with Astydamas's.

(2) A 4th-century Apulian amphora from Ruvo (*LIMC* I, 'Antigone' no. 14; Taplin 2007, no. 64) depicts what is very probably a tragic scene: on the left Antigone is held with bound hands by an armed guard while a dejected Haemon stands behind them; in the centre Heracles stands in an aedicula and addresses an elderly Creon, who listens with some discomfort; behind Creon are a boy holding a libation-bowl, an old woman (probably Creon's wife Eurydice), and in the background Ismene holding a casket (denoting her domesticity). Another amphora now in Berlin (*LIMC* 'Antigone' no. 15) has a simplified version: the guard with Antigone, the boy**,** Heracles addressing an enthroned (and younger) Creon, another guard standing behind Creon, and the dejected Haemon now on the right. These scenes could readily be connected with Astydamas's play except that the Ruvo vase may have been made before the play was produced in 341; if so, they must represent another unknown tragedy.[13]

---

[11] In *Poetics* 1454b19ff. Aristotle cites 'the spear that the Earthborn bear' (λόγχην ἣν φοροῦσι Γηγενεῖς) to exemplify recognition by a visible mark, in his view the worst kind of recognition device (see also on Carcinus's *Aerope*, pp. 62f.). The *Poetics* was probably written in the 330s, so the phrase, which makes most of an iambic trimeter, could be a quotation from Astydamas's play

[12] Bibliography on this much debated question and the interpretation of the vases is conveniently gathered by Kannicht in *TrGF* 5.1.262f.; see also Taplin 2007, 185f.

[13] Estimates of the date of the Ruvo vase vary: 'around the middle of the 4th century' Trendall–Cambitoglou 1978, 401, 413; 'ca. 350s' Taplin; '350–340' Krauskopf in *LIMC* V.1, 'Ismene'; 'about 350' Schefold–Jung 1989, 85, Vollkommer 1988, 13 fig. 18; '340–320' *TrGF* 5, 262; '330/320' Webster 1954, 304 and 1956, 63. Taplin leaves open the possibility that the vase might reflect Euripides' plot while admitting that there is no evidence that Heracles had a role in Euripides' play. The Sophoclean hypotheses and scholia strongly suggest that Euripides like Sophocles set his play at the time of Polynices' burial.

Some scholars have more or less confidently identified both Hyginus's story and the vase scenes with Astydamas's Antigone,[14] *but there are discrepancies between the two. In Hyginus Heracles' plea is rejected and this leads to Haemon's murder-suicide, whereas in the vases Heracles addresses Creon with an authority which seems to imply that he will be obeyed:*[15] *Hyginus's ending might just be a matter of mythographic contamination (reverting to a Sophoclean ending), but it could equally reflect a Hellenistic tragedy which added a further melodramatic twist to the intervention of Heracles reflected in the vase-paintings. In addition to this, the boy depicted on the vases, while reasonably identified as Antigone's and Haemon's son Maeon, can hardly be identified as the young athlete who has come to Thebes to compete in the games, who must have been a young adult like Paris in Euripides'* Alexander. *So it looks as if the vases and Hyginus may represent two different though fundamentally similar tragedies. Astydamas's play may be the one represented in the vase-paintings if the Ruvo vase was made after 341.*

[14] E.g. Paton, Séchan, Webster, Xanthakis-Karamanos, Vollkommer 1988, 63, Kannicht (above, n. 12), Karamanou, Liapis–Stephanopoulos. Zimmermann notes that details found in Hyginus but not in the vase-paintings are unreliable.

[15] It is often assumed that the vases portray Heracles as a *deus ex machina* since on the Ruvo vase he stands in what looks like a *hêrôon* with his name carved on the lintel. This might however be simply an indication of his heroic (pre-divine) status. Nothing in the scene suggests that he is speaking *ex machina*; nor does the Berlin vase, where there is no *hêrôon* and Creon is seated on a throne as he listens to Heracles. Heracles was said to have married Creon's daughter Megara long before his deification (and directly after his intervention for Antigone according to Hyginus *Fab.* 72).

ΕΚΤΩΡ

Webster 1954, 305f.; Snell 1971, 138–53; Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 162–69 (≈ 1981b); Taplin 2009; Wright 2016a, 103–5; Liapis 2016; Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 32–35. See **F 1h**, **F 1i** and **F 2a** below for editions of the papyri, and footnote 18 for the vase-painting Berlin 1984.45.

*The epigram **T 9** and Plutarch's naming of the play in **F 1(h)** suggest that this was Astydamas's best known tragedy. Ancient sources provide one brief quotation (**F 2**), which crucially shows that the play included a scene recalling (but not necessarily replicating) the scene in* Iliad *6 in which Hector bade farewell to his wife and son. Three Hellenistic papyri are plausibly assigned to the same play (**F 1h**, **F 1i**, **F 2a**). Two more papyri and a late 4th-century Apulian vase are of more doubtful relevance.*

The main papyrus fragments have the following content:

F 1h fr. 1, end of a scene followed by a rubric calling for a choral song, then agitated lines addressed to Apollo and voicing fear at a prophecy revealed by the seer Helenus;

F 1h fr. 2, part of a speech referring to Achilles' loss of his arms (seized by Hector from the body of Patroclus) and his mother Thetis having brought him new arms from Hephaestus;

F 1h fr. 3, a dialogue in which someone seems determined to leave and is addressed as a protector;

F 1i, someone brings bad news to Hector and encourages him to see to the defence of the city, Hector responds by calling for the captured arms of Achilles, and despite his own misgivings rejects advice to hold back from combat;

F 2a, part of a report-speech describing Hector's combat with Achilles.

There is no record of any other tragedy on this subject, and all of the papyrus texts give prominence to the armour of Achilles which Hector has seized from Patroclus's corpse and will use in their final encounter (Snell 1971, 141f.). Thus it is very likely that they all represent Astydamas's play. If so, it will have focused on the character of Hector, his decision to face Achilles, and his death in the fatal combat, with the fragments ordered as follows (and printed here accordingly):

F 1h fr. 2, earlier events leading to Achilles' rejoining the battle and threatening the city, possibly narrated in a prologue.

F 1h fr. 1, the scene in Troy: fearful reactions to the havoc wrought by Achilles on the battlefield and to a pessimistic prophecy of Helenus.

HECTOR

F 1i, **F 1h** fr. 3, Achilles' successes reported; Hector's fatal decision.
F 2: Hector's farewell and departure for battle.
F 2a: messenger's report of the combat and Hector's death.

*The play perhaps ended with the laments of Hector's family (*Iliad *22. 405ff.) and a divine announcement that his body would be protected by the gods and eventually returned by Achilles for burial. Astydamas thus seems to have modelled his play on the events of the* Iliad *while reworking details and motifs into a form fitting a tragedy set within the city of Troy. On these points see further the notes below.*

Trojan war themes, and Achilles above all, were a popular subject for fifth- and fourth-century tragedies, but no other Greek Hector *is known and this play is virtually unique in focusing on his final combat with Achilles.*[16] *It was probably the model for Naevius's Latin tragedy* Hector Proficiscens (Hector Setting Forth)*, of which only two verses survive, both perhaps from that play's emblematic scene.*[17]

The two papyri more doubtfully associated with this play are:

(1) P. Oxy. 36.2746 (c. 200 AD), ed. R. A. Coles, 1968 (**adesp. F 649**): Cassandra, Priam, Deiphobus and a chorus witness Hector's combat and death from the walls of Troy. The many peculiarities of this text suggest a Hellenistic composition, and the details of the combat differ from those in **F 2a**. See further below, pp. 371–79.

(2) P. Oxy. 76.5075 (c. 200 AD), ed. E. W. Handley, 2011: ends of nine lines of lyric or recitative dialogue in dactylic or iambic-dactylic metre followed by the rubric 'Choral Song' (ΧΟΡΟΥ ΜΕΛΟΣ: cf. below on **F 1h**.10). The metre suggests a tragic scene of heightened emotion; a father and son bid farewell to each other, the son is perhaps leaving for battle. There is no clear indication of context or identities, so a connection with Astydamas's play is no more than a possibility.

---

[16] He is however a leading character in [Eur.] *Rhesus*. Aeschylus, Dionysius of Syracuse (below, pp. 180–5) and Timesitheus (*TrGF* 214, date unknown) each produced a *Ransoming of Hector* based on *Iliad* 24.

[17] Naevius frs 14–15 Ribbeck (»» Spaltenstein 2014, §§ 1044, 1046, 1063). Naevius's play has often been assigned to the context of *Iliad* 6. Spaltenstein argues that he must have used an Alexandrian model because classical Greek tragedians did not compose plays focused essentially on Troy and Trojans, but besides Astydamas's *Hector* see e.g. Aeschylus's *Memnon*, Sophocles' *Alexander*, *Laocoon*, *Troilus*, Euripides' *Alexander* and both the Euripidean and the extant *Rhesus*.

The vase-painting mentioned above is on a fine late fourth-century Apulian volute-krater, over a metre in height, depicting Hector's parting from his wife and infant son.[18] *On its lower level Andromache holds the child as he reaches out towards Hector, who is armed with breastplate, greaves, shield and spear. They stand behind a four-horse chariot whose driver is placed dominantly at the centre of the scene and brandishes Hector's shining helmet. The upper level shows Cassandra apparently suffering a mantic fit and supported by a woman (Hecuba?). They are flanked on the left by a man holding a sceptre (Priam?) and on the right by a spear-carrying trumpeter, while on the far right a male seer, presumably Helenus, observes an ominous portent, an eagle carrying a snake in its talons (cf.* Iliad *12.200–250). M. Schmidt's identification of this scene with Astydamas's play was accepted by Kannicht in* TrGF I^2 *352 (cf.* MusTr *138f.). The case for it is fully argued by Taplin, but there are strong reasons for doubting it:*[19]

(1) The scene does not include features that typically indicate a dramatic source; the tripod next to Cassandra might do so but is better explained as marking her sanctuary (Taplin 2009, 256; cf. 2007, 43 with

F 1(h) Plutarch, *Moralia* 349f

ταῦθ' ἡ πόλις ἑορτάζει καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτων θύει τοῖς θεοῖς, οὐκ ἐπὶ ταῖς Αἰσχύλου νίκαις ἢ Σοφοκλέους, οὐδ' ὅτε Καρκίνος Ἀερόπῃ †συνῆν† ἢ Ἕκτορι Ἀστυδάμας, ἀλλ' ἕκτῃ μὲν ἱσταμένου Βοηδρομιῶνος ἐσέτι νῦν τὴν ἐν Μαραθῶνι νίκην ἡ πόλις ἑορτάζει.

F 1h P. Hibeh 2.174 (2nd C. BC). ed. Turner 1955, cf. Maehler in *TrGF* 1^2.352 (fr. 1.12–14)

fr. 2 *remains of one iambic verse*

]ν Ἀχιλλέα π̣ . [*c. 10 letters*]ω̣μεν[
.] Ἀτρειδ[*c. 11 letters*]ματ[
. .]π̣εύειν̣ . [. . .]. [. . . .] δόρυ[
. . .] . ν ὅπλων ἐστερημένο . [
. . .]τ̣ο̣υ̣ ποντίαν ἥκειν Θ[έτιν

[18] Giuliani 1995, 122–23, Kat. 5 (cf. 1988, 18–24); Taplin 2007, 252–54 with colour-plate no. 101 and bibliography p. 290 n. 78.

[19] See especially Giuliani 1995 (above) and now Liapis 2016, 84.

n. 173), and a four-horse chariot is hard to imagine in this context (cf. Taplin 2009, 256 n. 14).

*(2) The vase's charioteer can hardly be the 'servant' who takes Hector's helmet (**F 2**). The helmet shines brightly in the vase-painting, but this may simply reflect Hector's formulaic identification as κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ (38 times in the* Iliad*); Astydamas seems to have emphasized the shield, not the helmet, and in his play both were Achilles' arms seized by Hector from Patroclus (**F 1i**.5–6 n.).*

*(3) Taplin adds that Priam and Cassandra appear with Deiphobus in **adesp. F 649**, but see on this above; the only figure on the upper level of the vase-painting certainly mentioned in the play is Helenus (**F 1h**.9–12). Giuliani argues plausibly that Cassandra and Helenus are contextually relevant, reminding the viewer of Hector's approaching doom, and that they and the chariot follow iconographic schemata rather than a poetic narrative.*

All things considered, the vase-painting cannot be relied on as evidence for the content of Astydamas's play, although the popularity of the play in the later fourth century may have influenced the vase-painter's choice of this subject and some of his details.

F 1(h) Plutarch, *On the fame of the Athenians*

These (i.e. Athens' military and naval successes) are the things the city celebrates, for these it sacrifices to the gods, not for the victories of Aeschylus and Sophocles, nor on the day when Carcinus †*was involved with*† his *Aerope* or Astydamas with his *Hector*, but on the sixth of Boëdromion even now it celebrates the victory at Marathon.

F 1h Hibeh papyrus

fr. 2 dialogue verses:

. . . . . Achilles . . . . . sons of Atreus . . . . . spear . . . . . deprived of (his) arms . . . . . that *(his mother?)* sea-dwelling Thetis has come[20] *(bringing)* finer *(arms from)* Hephae(stus)[21] . . . . . is present/possible . . . . . .[23] . . . . .

. . . . .]. . καλ̣λ̣ίον’ Ἡφαί̣[στου πάρα
remains of four more verses including 23 πάρεστι

20 τὴν μήτερ’ αὐ]τοῦ Webster *ap.* Turner

fr. 1 col. 1 (foot of column) ends of five iambic verses including
1 κλυει̣[2]πυρούμενον 5] . . ποιοῦνται μέτα (*or* μέγα? Snell)

fr. 1 col. 2 (foot of next column) remains of four verses, probably iambic, including 9 ?χρ]ησμός, *then:*

ΧΟΡΟΥ ΜΕΛΟΣ 10

Λυ̣κ́ίη̣[ς . . . . .] Φοῖβε, τίνα κλύω τὸν α̣[
ὁ θυηπόλος [. .] μάντις Ἕλενος ετ̣αχεοσ̣ [
̣ο̣ι̣[̣]ανοι ̣[. . .] ̣ ἐσιδὼν φόβον ἔχω τι[
πρᾷ̣ξ̣ι̣ς τ̣ι̣ς . . [. .] χερὸς ὅτ’ ἄλλον ἔνοικον [

11 Λυκίη[ς ἀνάσσων] Turner (or τύραννε Snell) 12 [γὰρ] Turner (or δὲ Snell) ετ̣αχεοσ̣ [Maehler (ε ̣ . αχ[̣]π̣ ̣[Turner 13 e.g. φοιτ̣αν οκ̣ (*i.e.* οις̣) Maehler 14 perhaps τίς ἐσ[τι] Maehler (τίς ᾗ̣ν Turner)

fr. 3: see below after ***F 1i****.*

F 1i P. Amherst 2.10 (2nd C. BC), ed. Grenfell–Hunt 1901 with supplements by F. Blass, cf. Weil 1901, Radermacher 1902, 137f., Pickard-Cambridge 1933, 152f., Page 1941, 160–63.

trace of one line
ἄνδρες πρ[̣]σ̣α̣[
ταῦτ’ ἀγγελῶν σοῖς οὐ καθ̣’ [ἡδονὴν δόμοις
ἥκω· σὺ δ’, ὦναξ, τῆς ἐκεῖ φρ[ουρᾶς
φρόντιζ’, ὅπως σοι καιρίως ἕ[ξει τάδε.
⟨Ἕκτωρ⟩ χώρει πρὸς οἴκους ὅπλα τ’ ἐ[κκόμιζέ μοι 5
καὶ τὴν Ἀχιλλέως δοριάλωτ[ον ἀσπίδα.
ἔξω γὰρ αὐτὴν τήνδε κα̣[ὶ
ἀλλ’ ἐκποδών μοι στῆθι μη[

fr. 1 col. 1 *ends of five dialogue verses including* 1 . . . (*you?*) hear. . . 2 . . . burning . . . 5 they are making . . . with . . .

fr. 1 col. 2 *remnants of four dialogue verses including probably* 9 prophecy, *then a rubric* CHORAL SONG *and lyric verses (*11–14*):*

O Phoebus (*lord*) of Lycia, what is this . . . that I hear? The priest-seer Helenus . . . Witnessing . . . I feel fear . . . *(there is/was?)* some hand's action, when . . . another inhabitant . . . .

fr. 3: see below after ***F 1i****.*

F 1i Amherst papyrus

End of a report-speech and beginning of Hector's response:

. . . . . men . . . . . These things have I come, not *(with pleasure)*, to report to your *(house)*. But you, my lord, take thought for our defence there, to ensure that *(you have these things ordered)* as they should be.

Hector. Go to my house and *(bring me out the)* arms[5] and the *(shield)* of Achilles which I captured with my spear. I shall hold that very one . . . . . But stand aside . . . . . everything for me.

ἡμῖν ἅπαντα· καὶ γὰρ εἰς λ̣α̣[γῶ φρένας
ἄγοις ἂν ἄνδρα καὶ τὸν εὐθα̣[ρσέστατον,
ἐγώ τ’ ἐμαυτοῦ χειροῦ̣[
καί πως τ[έθ]ραυσμαι δ[
ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν ἧσ̣[σον . . .]. . [
ἐλθὼν δ’ ε[

3 φρ[ουρᾶς μολών Blass φρ[ουρᾶς πέρι/ὕπερ Cropp (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 709f.) 5 ἔ[κφερ’ ὡς τάχος Taplin 8 μὴ [διεργάσῃ Blass 11 χείροῦ̣ [ἂν δείξαιμ’ (*or* θείην) ἐμέ Snell 13 ἧσ̣[σον Snell 14 ἐ[ς οἴκους Diggle ἐ[φ’ υἱὸν Πηλέως *(e.g.)* Liapis

F 1h P. Hibeh 2.174 *(continued from above)*

fr. 3 *dialogue verses:*

μήτε σ̣κι̣[
ἀλλ’ εἰ̣ δεδ[
μενει̣[
ἡμεῖς δ[
— ὦ φῶς α̣[
μηθ̣ . [
ου[
— *(paragraphus marking speaker-change)*

27 δέδ[οικας Turner δέδ[οκται? Snell 28 μενεῖ̣[ν Turner (or μένει̣[ν)

F 2 Schol. Hom. *Iliad* 6.472a

αὐτίκ’ ἀπὸ κρατὸς κόρυθ’ εἵλετο φαίδιμος ⟨Ἕκτωρ⟩: σημειοῦνταί τινες τοῦτον διὰ τὸ τὸν τραγικὸν Ἀστυδάμαντα παράγειν τὸν Ἕκτορα λέγοντα·

δέξαι κυνῆν μοι πρόσπολ’ †εμονδε
⟨μὴ⟩ καὶ φοβηθῇ παῖς.

κυνῆν μοι πρόσπολ’ Porson κοινήν μοι πρὸς πόλεμον δὲ schol. ⟨μὴ⟩ Cobet

F 2a P. Strasbourg inv. WG 304.2 (c. 250 BC), ed. Snell 1937, 84–89, cf. Page 1941, 160–63.

remnants of four line-beginnings, then:

ἀμ̣βὰς κολων[ὸν
ωσ̣ . . . . κα[

You would bring to *(a hare's mettle)* even the most resolute man,[10] and I *(would show myself worse?)* than my true self. Yes, I feel some dismay . . . . . but none the less . . . . . and I shall go and . . . . . .

F 1h Hibeh papyrus *(continued)*

*fr. 3 spoken lines (*26–32*):*

Neither . . . . . But if . . . . . *(to?)* remain . . . . . But we/I . . . . . — O light . . . . . .[30] nor(?) . . . . . *(another speaker-change at line 33)*

F 2 Scholia on *Iliad* 6

Straightway illustrious Hector took the helmet from his head: Some (editors) note this verse because of the tragedian Astydamas bringing on Hector saying:

Take my helmet, servant . . . *(lest)* my son be frightened.

F 2a Strasbourg papyrus

remnants of four line-beginnings, then: . . . ascending a/the hill . . .[5]

ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ἕκ[τωρ
ἐλάμ[βαν’ ἔγχος
σείων ἐπ’ αὐτὸ[ν
Ἕκτωρ δὲ πρῶτ[ος
ἐξα . . . αγ . [
ἔπτηξεν οι[
ἄκραν δ’ ὑπὲρ ἴτυν ξυμ[
ὡ⟨ς⟩ δ’ εἶδ’ Ἀχιλλεὺς Ἕκτορο[ς μάτην πεσὸν
εἰς γῆν κελαινὸν ἔγχος, ἡδο[νῆς ὕπο
ἀνηλάλαξεν, καὶ δι’ ὧν δια[
οὐδ’ αὐτός, αὐτὰ π[ρ]όσθε τ[
ἔπαισεν· ἀσπὶς δ’ οὐ διῆκ’ εἴσ[ω
ἀλλ’ ἴσχεν αὐτοῦ, δεσπ[ότην δ’ ὁπλισμάτων
τὸν καινὸν οὐ προ⟨ὔ⟩δωκ[ε
. . . .] δ’ Ἀχιλλεὺς τουπ[

14 end Page (πεσὸν μάτην Snell) 16 διε[πλάγη Page 17 τ[ιμηθέντ’ ὅπλα Page
18 end στόμα Snell ξίφος Page δόρυ Liapis 19 δ’ ὁπλισμάτων Page (θ’ Snell)

F 3, F 4 *are from* Hermes *(probably satyric) and* Heracles *(certainly so).*

ΝΑΥΠΛΙΟΣ

Nauplius has a diverse mythical history but is best known as the father of the inventive Palamedes whose death was contrived by Odysseus at Troy. Nauplius avenged his son’s death by luring the returning Greek fleet onto a reef with false beacons. The story may have been mentioned in the epic Nostoi (‘Returns’) *and was featured in several tragedies. Aeschylus’s and Euripides’s* Palamedes *were concerned with the framing, trial and execution of Palamedes, but each ended with Nauplius coming to Troy to accuse the Greek leaders over his son’s death (»» Collard–Cropp 2008b, 47f.). Sophocles’* Nauplios Katapleôn (Nau-

F 5 Stobaeus 4.52b.35
Ἀστυδάμαντος Ναυπλίου·

χαῖρ’, εἰ τὸ χαίρειν ἔστι που κάτω χθονός.
δοκῶ δ’· ὅπου γὰρ μὴ ἔστι λυπεῖσθαι βίῳ,
ἔστιν τὸ χαίρειν τῶν κακῶν λελησμένῳ.

. . . *(one-and-a-half lines mostly lost)* . . . For Hector . . . *grasped (his spear)* . . . . . brandishing (it?) at him . . .[5] . . . And Hector first . . .[10] . . . *(one-and-a-half lines mostly lost)* . . . crouched . . . . . over the top edge of the shield . . . And when Achilles saw that Hector's dark spear had fallen vainly to the ground, he gave an exultant cry,[15] and those *(arms?)* through which he himself had not . . . , the very arms that formerly *(he had honoured?)*, he struck; but the shield did not let the (*spear?)* through but held it there *(and)* did not betray *(the arms')* new master.[20] And Achilles . . . . . .

F 3, F 4 *See opposite.*

NAUPLIUS

plius Sailing In) *and* Nauplios Purkaeus (Nauplius Kindling Fire) *were probably separate plays dealing with his confrontation with the Greek leaders and his revenge (on these see Sommerstein 2010a). Astydamas composed both a* Palamedes *(known only from the Suda's list,* ***T 1****) and a* Nauplius *which is known only from Stobaeus's quotation but may have been similar to Sophocles'* Nauplios Katapleôn. ***F 5*** *might well have been addressed by Nauplius to his dead son. Entries in the Suda also ascribe a* Nauplius *to Philocles I (****T 1*** *in Vol. 1) and Lycophron of Chalcis (****T 3****, p. 293 below).*

F 5 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'Praise of death'

From Astydamas's *Nauplius*:

> Farewell, if perchance one can fare well beneath the earth. And so I believe, for where one cannot be pained by life, there can a man fare well, forgetful of his troubles.

INCERTAE FABULAE

F 6 Athenaeus 2.40b

καὶ Ἀστυδάμας δέ φησι·

θνητοῖσι τὴν ἀκεσφόρον
λύπης ἔφηνεν οἰνομήτορ᾽ ἄμπελον.

F 7 Stobaeus 3.36.4

Ἀστυδάμαντος·

γλώσσης περίπατός ἐστιν ἀδολεσχία.

F 8 Stobaeus 4.29.3

Ἀστυδάμαντος·

γένους δ᾽ ἔπαινός ἐστιν ἀσφαλέστατος
κατ᾽ ἄνδρ᾽ ἐπαινεῖν, ὅστις ἂν δίκαιος ᾖ
τρόπους τ᾽ ἄριστος, τοῦτον εὐγενῆ καλεῖν.
〈 〉 ἐν ἑκατὸν ἔστιν ἄνδρ᾽ εὑρεῖν ἕνα,
κεἰ τοῦτον οἱ ζητοῦντες εἰσὶ μύριοι.

4 〈ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ〉 ἐν ἑκατόν ἐστιν Grotius ἕνεκα τῶν ἐστιν Stob. 〈μόλις δ᾽〉 ἐν ἑκατὸν ἔστιν Hense (〈τῶν δ᾽ οὐδ᾽〉 West, 〈τῶνδ᾽ οὐκ〉 Cropp) ἄνδρ᾽ εὑρεῖν Headlam, West εὑρεῖν ἄνδρ᾽ Stob. 5 κεἰ Porson (κἂν . . . ὦσι Grotius) καὶ Stob.

Brief fragment: **F 9** ὁ χαλκοῦς ὁδός

UNIDENTIFIED PLAYS

F 6 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*

And again, Astydamas says:

> He (Dionysus) revealed to mortals grief's cure-bringer, wine's mother, the grapevine.

F 7 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On idle talk'

Astydamas:

> Idle talk is a tongue's promenade.

F 8 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On nobility'

Astydamas:

> The surest praise of birth is to praise with regard to the man, to call well-born whoever is just and best in conduct. *(But?)* it is *(not)* possible to find one *(such?)* man in a hundred, even if those seeking him are thousands.

Brief fragment: **F 9** The Bronze Threshold[20]

Notes on Astydamas II

T 1

See on Astydamas I, p. 23 above.

T 2(a), (b)

Two versions of the same proverb tradition transmitted by Pausanias and Zenobius in the second century AD. The subject is obviously Astydamas II, here confused with his father. A statue of him was a prominent feature of the 'Lycurgan' Theatre of Dionysus, whose construction was completed in the 330s (**T 8a–**

[20] Not an exact quotation. The Bronze Threshold was an area in the sanctuary of Poseidon at Colonus surrounding a chasm which was thought to be an entrance to the underworld. Oedipus descends through the chasm at the end of Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* (*OC* 56–58, 1590ff.). Schol. *OC* 57 notes Astydamas's mention of it. In *Iliad* 8.15 'iron gates and a bronze threshold' belong to Tartarus itself.

b). The anecdote traces the proverb to a verse of the comic playwright Philemon (fr. 160 *PCG*), who seems to have been producing at Athens as early as 341. According to the anecdote Philemon's verse alluded to Astydamas's self-praise in an inscription which he composed for a statue of himself voted by the Athenian assembly, and which was rejected by the council as inappropriately boastful. The truth of the anecdote is often taken for granted,[21] but as D. L. Page observed, 'It would be an act of blind faith to accept the truth of the tale or the authenticity of the epigram' (Page 1981, 33). Stories explaining proverbs, and especially those tracing them to comic or other such sources, are notoriously unreliable, and some elements of this one cannot be true. A single dramatic victory would hardly have been dignified with a statue awarded by the Athenian demos, and the honorand of a publicly decreed statue would not have been invited to contribute his own inscription. The style of the epigram — omitting the honorand's name, speaking in the first person, focusing on poetic reputation rather than civic service — is unsuitable for this purpose,[22] and the honorand would hardly have used the occasion to complain about being afflicted by *phthonos*. This is clearly a literary epigram, not a civic one.

Some elements of the story are however true: (1) A statue of Astydamas did stand in the Theatre of Dionysus, inscribed only with the poet's name, and may have been placed there not long after the production of *Parthenopaeus* in 340 (see on **T 8a–b)**. It must have been authorized by a decree of the *ekklêsia*, and the decree presumably recognized the poet's civic contributions, especially to the Athenian theatre. Astydamas belonged to a distinguished theatrical family and may well have supported the development of the Lycurgan theatre politically and financially.[23] (2) Philemon did write the verse about Astydamas's self-praise which generated the proverb, and this probably was prompted by something in Astydamas's behaviour.[24] (3) Someone at some point composed the epigram.

---

[21] E.g. Webster 1954, 306; Snell 1971, 152; Bing 1988, 60; Wilson 1996, 316f.; Hanink 2014, 51f., 183–88; Papastamati-von Moock 2014, 23–33, Duncan–Liapis 2019, 180f., 203; Liddel 2020, I.774f. Others are more cautious, e.g. Scodel 2007, 148

[22] Cf. Bühler 1999, 417f. following Wilamowitz 1924, I.130.

[23] The Athenian democratic regime of the 340s and 330s increasingly encouraged leading citizens to contribute financially to civic initiatives, and rewarded such contributions with public recognition in the form of honorary decrees, awards of crowns etc., although awards of statues remained rare and controversial (this may help to explain the negative reaction to Astydamas's statue reflected in the anecdote). On these developments see Domingo Gygax 2016, ch. 4, esp. 207–34.

[24] The sources' implication that other poets mocked Astydamas for the same reason is probably just an anecdotal exaggeration.

Some scholars dismiss the anecdote but believe that this was Astydamas himself.[25] The epigram is elegantly composed, and the image of the poet competing vainly in a race against his predecessors is already found in the late 5th century (see below). Astydamas might have composed it for a private statue or portrait, or for a text of one or more of his plays.[26] On the other hand, there are many Hellenistic literary epigrams composed in the personae of past poets and purporting to be inscriptions for their statues, portraits, books or tombs. These often compare the poets' achievements, more or less modestly, with those of their predecessors, contemporaries or successors.[27]

The anecdote probably originated with a Peripatetic writer such as Chamaeleon, or Clearchus of Soloi whose writings *On Ways of Life* and *On Proverbs* provided many of the fanciful anecdotes and proverb-explanations quoted in the later proverb tradition and above all by Athenaeus (Astydamas's 'excessive' behaviour and its come-uppance are an apt subject for Clearchus's brand of moralising). If that is so, the anecdote originated within a few decades of Astydamas's death and may have blended some true details (the success of *Parthenopaeus*, the statue inscribed only with the poet's name, his reputed self-importance and Philemon's verse, possibly a dispute over honouring him with a statue) into the fiction of Astydamas's failed attempt to have the epigram inscribed on the statue.

As noted above, the epigram is essentially literary. **Would I had lived in their times etc.:** cf. Theocritus 7.86ff. with Bing 1988, 61f. noting that Lycidas's wish simply to hear the singing of the mythical Comatas differs from Astydamas's regret that he cannot compete fairly with his illustrious predecessors.[28]

---

[25] E.g. Wilamowitz and Bühler (above, n. 22).

[26] Wilamowitz noted the self-promoting epigrams which the painter Parrhasius (late 5th C.) was said to have added to his paintings (Clearchus frs 41–42 Wehrli = Athenaeus 15.687b, 12.543c–e), but their authenticity too is debated (»» Page 1981, 130, cf. 495f.).

[27] E.g. Dioscorides' epigram on Thespis, *Anth.Pal.* 7.410 (= Thespis **T 8(a)** in Vol. 1) or the epigram attributed to Phrynichus in Plutarch, *Mor.* 732f (Phrynichus T 13, *Anth.Gr.Appendix* 3.18); also *Anth.Pal.* 7.5 (Homer: statue), 7.11 (Erinna: book), 7.15, 7.17 (Sappho), 7.54 (Hesiod), 7.414 (Rhinthon), 7.709 (Alcman), 7.718 (Nossis: all tombs). There are of course 'third-person' epigrams formulated similarly. On the themes of such epigrams see Bing 1988, 56–67. Page (1981, 119–30) discusses all those ascribed to famous names of the pre-Alexandrian period and concludes that almost all are either obviously fictitious or at least suspect: cf. Argentieri 1998, 2–4.

[28] Bing p. 59 suggests that the epigram refers to the poet's having to 'compete' with revivals of 5th-century tragedies at the City Dionysia, but this makes the

So I had started with them etc.: Page (1981, 34) correctly identifies 'the language of the stadium': **ἀφεθείς** 'dispatched' (from the starting-gate, cf. LSJ 'ἄφεσις' 5), **παράμιλλος** 'competing side-by-side' (not 'beyond rivalry' as in LSJ), **προέχουσ(ι) they are ahead** (LSJ 'προέχω' B.2). The same is true of **οὐχ ἕπεται does not keep pace** (LSJ '*ἕπω' I.4). The image of the poet competing vainly in a race against his predecessors is already found in Choerilus of Samos's proem to his epic poem on the Persian Wars (late 5th C.: *SH* 317, cf. Bing 1988, 60 n. 17). **[So I had started:** ὡς with past indicative expressing the unfulfilled consequence of an unfulfilled condition (Goodwin 1889, 120, §333). Bentley's **ᾧ, which** makes better sense than οἷς 'whom', which has no explicit antecedent. The point is that time outpaces envy so that the great men of the past are no longer subjected to it.**]**

T 8a–b

The stone bearing the first half of Astydamas's name is one of two blocks on which his bronze statue stood in the Theatre of Dionysus. These were set into the coping of the retaining wall between the orchestra and the west parodos, so that the statue was highly visible (perhaps contributing to Astydamas's reputation for self-aggrandisement). Recent study indicates that this was done during the construction of the Lycurgan theatre (»» Papastamati-von Moock 2014, 23–33 with comments on previous studies). The construction may then have been nearing completion in 340 when Astydamas's *Parthenopaeus* was produced (so e.g. Papastamati-von Moock 25, 28f.). The story that the statue was awarded to honour this success cannot be strictly true (see above on **T 2a–b**), but the date of the decree authorizing it would have been known from its official language. For doubts on all this see Ma 2013, 106 n. 265, 110, Domingo Gygax 2016, 229.

Diogenes Laertius's comment (**T 8a**) probably reflects the same anecdotal tradition as **T 2a–b**. It is far from clear that the part concerning the statue derives from Heraclides Ponticus (Astydamas's contemporary). Statues of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides were placed in the Theatre of Dionysus through a decree sponsored by Lycurgus ([Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* 841f), thus in the same years as Astydamas's statue. Even if the latter came first, honours for long-dead poets were a different matter from honours for living community leaders (cf. above on **T 2a–b**). **[Aeschylus and company:** lit. 'those around Aeschylus', probably meaning Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides but possibly Aeschylus alone (so Hermann and others). Wilamowitz, Snell and others retain Diogenes' πρῶτον and understand 'first of the family of Aeschylus' (i.e. Astydamas's theatrical forebears), but that is a much less likely basis for Diogenes' complaint.**]**

---

complaint rather too specific. It is the reputations of the classic tragedians that Astydamas cannot match.

T 9
A fragmentary Hellenistic epigram from the same papyrus as Aristarchus **F 1a** (see note there for details). The missing play-name was almost certainly *Hector*. Francesca Maltomini (2001, 61) notes that the phrase **for his fatherland** (**περὶ πάτρης**) is identified with Hector in the *Iliad* (12.243, 15.496, 25.500, cf. *Anth.Pal.* 7.140.4 ὑπὲρ πάτρας).

F 1b
Aristotle goes on to rank these two types of action as inferior to those in which a kin-murder is forestalled by a recognition as in Euripides' *Cresphontes* and *Iphigenia in Tauris* (and in the Hellenistic plots discussed below, pp. 394–410). **Telegonus in *Odysseus Wounded*:** i.e. in Sophocles' play usually known as *Odysseus Acanthoplêx (Odysseus Spine-struck*: *TrGF* 4, F 453–461a). Telegonus was Odysseus's son by Circe, born after he left her island. As an adult he reached Ithaca in search of his father but killed him unwittingly in a battle with the islanders, wounding him with a spear tipped with the barb of a sting-ray. »» *GEF* pp. 164–71 (the epic *Telegony*); Gantz 1993, 710–12.

F 1c
A commonplace liberally ilustrated in Stobaeus 2.15, the source of this fragment; cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 139.

F 1h, *fr. 2*
The subject is the replacement of Achilles' lost arms with divinely made arms brought by Thetis from Hephaestus (*Iliad* 18–19). Turner identified three possible dramatic contexts: (1) a prologue-speech spoken by a god who would know the relevant facts; (2) a report of Achilles' re-entry into the battle (one wonders how a Trojan observer could know about the new arms, but if that is taken for granted this could be the report which ends with the beginning of **F 1i**: cf. Snell 1971, 144f.); (3) a continuation of Hector's speech in **F 1i** (subject to the same objection as (2), and it seems unlikely that the facts would be introduced at that late stage).

F 1h, *fr. 1*
End of a dialogue scene (1–9, speakers uncertain) probably mentioning the **prophecy** (9) of Helenus (11–12), either revealed in this scene or now awaited. The rubric ΧΟΡΟΥ ΜΕΛΟΣ, CHORAL SONG is found in tragic papyri only in adesp. F 625.9, adesp. F 640b.28 (*TrGF* 5.1131–34, from a play similar to Aeschylus's

Myrmidons) and P. Oxy. 76.5075.10 (see above, p. 35).[29] At first sight it suggests an *embolimon* ('insert') of the kind that Aristotle says was used by some tragic poets in his day (*Poetics* 1456a27ff.: Agathon **T 8**). The notation XOPOY regularly indicates an incidental act-dividing song in the papyrus texts of Menander's comedies (also in the manuscript tradition of Aristophanes' two latest extant plays, *Assemblywomen* at lines 729, 886 and *Wealth* at lines 321, 626, 770, 801, 1096). But tragedy is a different matter and in these instances the notation probably means that an act-dividing song which was originally part of the text is omitted in this copy (»» Pöhlmann 1977, Taplin 2009, 58, Liapis 2016, 76f., Jackson 2020, 139–47).[30] It is not likely to be a stage direction referring to lines 11–14,[31] which are agitated lyric or recitative verses beginning the new episode, perhaps delivered by the chorus or its leader (Liapis 72) or less probably Priam (Webster *ap.* Turner; Snell). The sense of line 14 is unclear: **some hand's action** might imply violent action (LSJ 'χείρ' II.4.d), i.e. the coming combat? Liapis 72–74 offers a speculative reconstruction of lines 11–14.

[Metre of 11–14: Snell suggested galliambics (an ionic form: ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – – ¦ ⏑ ⏑ – – ⏑ ⏑ –) but this is reasonably questioned by Liapis 75f. This could be a routine combination of iambics and dochmiacs with frequent resolution.**]**

F 1i

The first of the relevant papyri to have been discovered and published. Its identification with Astydamas's *Hector* (Weil, Radermacher) was questioned by Pickard-Cambridge and Page, but their main argument, that Astydamas's play must have re-enacted the events of *Iliad* 6 in view of **F 2**, is not cogent. This fragment and the others in fact evoke various elements of the *Iliad* while adapting them to the poet's own dramatic design. The messenger's advice to see to the protection of the threatened city (3–4) recalls a similar plea of Andromache in *Iliad* 6.431–39 (cf. Weil 1901, 739). Hector rejects the advice (8–10) as he rejects the pleas of Andromache in that scene and of Priam and Hecuba before the final duel (*Il.* 22, 56ff., 82ff.). He calls caution cowardice as he does when rejecting Polydamas's advice to retire into the city (*Il.* 18.284–7, 306f.) despite his earlier reliance on that advice (12.58ff., 13.723ff.; he regrets the rejection too late, 22.96ff.). He is apprehensive yet determined (12–14) as in his final dialogue with Andromache (*Il.* 6.441ff.).

---

[29] P. Lit.Lond. 77 (= adesp. F 667a, *TrGF* 5.1137–42) with XOPOY at line 113 is from a sub-Euripidean *Medea* of uncertain character, hardly a tragedy: »» O'Sullivan–Collard 2013, 488–97.

[30] Such an omission is seen in a papyrus fragment of Euripides' *Hippolytus* (P. Sorb. 2252) where the lyric lines 58–62 are omitted and the gap between 57 and 73 probably contained an appropriate notation.

[31] As suggested by Jackson 2020, 73–75.

Hector's call for his arms (5–7) presumably led to an arming scene before his farewell and departure. In the *Iliad* (17.183ff.) he dons Achilles' armour near the battlefield immediately after killing Patroclus, and Zeus reflects that the armour will not save him from his approaching death; he has seized it improperly (οὐ κατὰ κόσμον, 17.205) and will soon pay for that with his life. The dramatic scene must have evoked similar forebodings. Hector's anxiety here contrasts with his persistent bravado in the near-contemporary *Rhesus* (cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos 168, Liapis 68f. and especially *Rhes.* 34–40, 79f.).

The speaker of lines 1–4 sounds more like a nameless soldier or lookout than a significant character such as Polydamas (Weil), although Polydamas is not ruled out by his addressing Hector as **my lord** (Aeneas does the same in *Rhes.* 130). Hector's call for his arms may be addressed to this man, in which case the man probably leaves to fetch the arms rather than staying to converse further with Hector (Snell 146f. assumes that he stayed). The rest of Hector's speech, then, will have been addressed to a character who has already warned him of the dangers he faces, perhaps Polydamas (Weil again) or Andromache (Taplin: but if so, Hector treats her very dismissively).

5–6 *(the)* arms and the shield of Achilles: the Greek could mean 'bring me arms and the shield of Achilles' but must, I think, mean that Hector will use all of Achilles' captured arms (cf. the plurals in **F 2a**.16f.); it is hard to see why Astydamas would have abandoned the tradition on this crucial point. It follows that the helmet that might scare Astyanax in **F 2** is the helmet of Achilles, not Hector's as in *Iliad* 6 (cf. Snell 1971, 141f. and above, p. 37). This scene, though, seems to give more attention to the shield (6–7), like the combat narrative in **F 2a**.18ff. **9. to *(a hare's mettle)*:** the hare's fearfulness is proverbial, e.g. Aesop, *Fables* 143, 169 Hausrath–Hunger. **11. I *(would show myself worse?)* than my true self:** for restoration on these lines see Snell 1971, 147ff. Snell's suggestion that Hector expresses an 'inner conflict' in more or less Platonic terms ('I would show myself inferior to myself', i.e. allow my worse self to control my better self, cf. Pl. *Rep.* 431a–b) seems unnecessary though favoured by Xanthakis-Karamanos 168 (less so by Liapis 69 n. 29). **12. I feel some dismay:** lit. 'I am somewhat shattered'. For the milder sense here see LSJ 'θραύω' II and especially Plut. *Caesar* 19.6 ἦν μὲν οὖν ὅ τι καὶ . . . ἐτέθραυστο τῆς τόλμης, 'he was somewhat shaken from his boldness.' **καί** is affirmative as e.g. in Eur. *HF* 577 (Denniston 1954, 321). **14.** For the supplements suggested by Diggle ('into the house') and Liapis ('against the son of Peleus') see Liapis 65f., notes 17 and 18.

F 1h, *fr. 3*

Iambic dialogue, possibly between Hector (addressed as a protecting hero in **O light**) and the person advising him in **F 1i**. Hector would then be saying e.g. 'But if you are determined to remain, then do so; but I will go into battle'.

Snell's εἰ δέδ[οκται in line 27 gives 'if you are determined', Turner's εἰ δέδ[οικας 'if you are afraid'.

F 2

The only certain fragment of Astydamas's tragedy, fortunately quoted (though now corrupted) by a commentator on its Homeric model. The **servant** is unlikely to be the charioteer depicted in the Berlin vase (Taplin 2007, 254; 2009, 256) since, as Liapis 84 points out, Homeric charioteers were not mere 'servants'. The *Iliad* names and narrates the deaths of three charioteers of Hector: Eniopeus (8.119–23), Archeptolemus (8.125–9, 311–15) and Cebriones, a bastard brother of Hector killed by Patroclus (8.317–9, 16.737ff.).

F 2a

From a climactic report-speech describing Hector's combat with Achilles and his death. The hill perhaps recalls the hill in the open plain on which Hector assembled the Trojan forces in *Iliad* 2.811ff. Achilles avoids Hector's initial spear-cast by crouching behind his shield, and gives an exultant cry as the spear lands behind him. His own weapon (surely also a spear: Liapis 71 n. 38) fails to pierce the shield that was once his and now protects Hector. This sequence is the opposite of the *Iliad*'s (22.273ff.) where Achilles throws his spear first, Hector crouches to avoid it, and Hector's spear then glances off Achilles' shield. There is also no sign of Athena's interference as in the *Iliad* (cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos 167): there the goddess has impersonated Deiphobus and fooled Hector into facing Achilles (227ff.), and in the duel she returns Achilles' spear to him and leaves Hector without the second spear he expected Deiphobus to supply; Hector must now rely on his sword, and Achilles is able to thrust his spear into Hector's throat as he comes at him. Astydamas, it seems, eliminated the divine intervention and reduced the duel to a more normal process in which the heroes went on to fight at close quarters with swords. Xanthakis-Karamanos (167) notes similarities with Euripides' description of the duel between Eteocles and Polynices (*Pho*. 1382–1406). Both follow epic precedents.

[13. ὑπὲρ ἴτυν: the 4th-element split resolution (⏑ ⏑|⏑ –) is otherwise known only in late Euripides (*Ion* 931, *Bacch.* 940, *IA* 1164, 1459, cf. *Pho.* 538) and Theodectas **F 8**.5, mostly disyllabic preposition + noun. Cf. Cropp–Fick 1985, 42 (type 4.4), Liapis 71 n. 37.**]**

15. Hector's dark spear: both metallic and threatening death, cf. Pind. *Nem.* 10.84 κελαινεγχεῖ Ἄρει 'dark-speared Ares'. κελαινὸς was an epic epithet for blood, thunder-clouds, earth, darkness etc., extended in tragedy to swords (Soph. *Aj.* 231, Eur. *Bacch.* 628, Lycophr. *Alex.* 1169), a spearhead (Soph. *Trach.* 856). μέλας has similar connotations in the *Iliad* (Heiden 2008, 149f.). **16. he gave an exultant cry: ἀνηλάλαξεν** as in Eur. *Supp.* 719, *Pho.* 1395 (not 'raised a war-cry' here and in *Pho.* 1395 as Xanthakis-Karamanos suggests).

F 5

Death a happy release from life's troubles, e.g. Eur. *Hcld*. 592ff., F 449, F 833 all quoted with **F 5** in Stobaeus 8.52b. »» Kassel 1958, 75f.

F 6

Quoted in a long discussion of the beneficial properties of wine in Athenaeus, Book 2. For wine's power of freeing men from pain and grief Athenaeus also quotes Sophocles F 758 and Eur. *Bacch.* 772. »» Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 95f. suggesting Astydamas's *Athamas* might be the source. Or this could be from a satyr-play, like F 3–4 which Athenaeus also quotes.

F 7

Perhaps a comment on philosophers' talk. **ἀδολεσχία** ('indulgence in lengthy and aimless talk': Theophrastus, *Characters* 3.1) was often associated with sophists and philosophers, as was walking about (περιπατεῖν) while talking (like the Peripatetics of Aristotle's school): »» Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 140f. (but 'discussion of a theme' is not the basic sense of περίπατος as she implies). This too might be from a satyr-play (cf. Cipolla 2003, 288f., 306.).

F 8

Judge nobility by moral character, not by 'good birth' (*eugeneia* in its literal sense), a common theme, e.g. Euripides F 9, 61b–c, 336, 495.40–43, 527, all quoted with our fragment in Stobaeus 4.29 'On nobility (*eugeneia*)': »» Collard–Cropp–Gibert 2004, 76–78 on Eur. F 61b–c, Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 147–49. **4–5. *(not)* . . . one . . . in a hundred:** Stephanopoulos 1998, 5f. compares Theognis 83f., Soph. F 681, Eur. *Med.* 1088, *Hcld.* 327f.

[The last three words of line 4 need re-ordering to avoid a breach of Porson's Law, unless the fragment is from a satyr-play which seems unlikely. For the two missing syllables Grotius suggested '*(But)* it is *(not)* possible to find one man . . . ', Hense '*(But (only) with difficulty)* is it possible . . . '. West (1983a, 80) suggested that something like 'one *such* man' is needed, hence '*(But of them not even)* in a hundred is it possible . . . ', adapted in Cropp's '*(Of these* it is *(not)* possible . . . *'*. Russo 2008, 129–32 reviews less plausible conjectures.**]**

SOPHOCLES II
(*TrGF* 62)

Texts etc. *TrGF* 1^2.208 with *addenda* 1^2.353, 5.1109–11, 1145f.

A grandson of the famous tragedian (see on Iophon with ***T 1(c)*** *in Vol. 1) and producer of his* Oedipus at Colonus *in 401 (****T 3****). He went on to a successful career of his own, including a first Dionysia production in 396 (****T 4****) and others in 387 and 375 (T 5, T 6 in* TrGF *from the Fasti inscription). The Suda's mention of forty plays and seven victories is plausible enough but a little problematic (see notes on* ***T 1*** *and* ***T 4****).*

Two inscriptions may refer to productions by his grandfather:

(1) An inscription from Eleusis commemorates victories for a pair of joint choregoi, probably at a local Dionysia, with unidentified comic and tragic productions by 'Aristophanes' and 'Sophocles' respectively; the date is 'ca. late 5th C. BC' according to its recent editor.[1] This allows for the last years of Sophocles I's life, when he was over eighty years old, or the beginning of Sophocles II's career if his first productions were at rural festivals. Recent opinion favours Sophocles I.[2]

(2) An early fourth-century inscription from Halai Aixonides lists the victorious choregoi and poets in two comic and two tragic productions, perhaps in chronological order:[3] E . [ ] with Ecphantides's Peirai, Thrasybulus with Cratinus's Boukoloi, Thrasybulus again with Timotheus's Alcmeon, Alphesiboea and possibly further plays,[4] and Sophocles with a Telepheia, presumably a set of plays about Telephus.[5] The inscription is from the first quarter of the fourth century, but the productions by Ecphantides and Cratinus must have been before 420 (Timotheus is otherwise unknown unless this is the famous citharode). The fourth poet could

---

[1] *I.Eleusis* 53 ed. Clinton 2005–8 (= *IG* II^2 3090, *IG* I^3 970, *TrGF* DID B 3, Sophocles II T 7); »» *SEHT* II.93–95.

[2] E.g. Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 47f., Csapo 2010, 90f., Finglass 2015, 212–14, Csapo–Wilson 2015, 326 and *SEHT* II.

[3] *IG* II^3 4, 498 (formerly II^2 3091); »» *SEHT* II.122–26.

[4] Line 6 breaks off after ΑΛΦΕΣΙΒΟ[and could have continued with the names of a third tragedy and a satyr-play (»» Luppe 1969, 149; *SEHT* II.123).

[5] A *Telepheia* by Sophocles I could have included his known tragedies *Sons of Aleus*, *Mysians* and *Telephus*: »» Radt in *TrGF* 4.434.

be either Sophocles I or Sophocles II; both this and the identity of the festival are open questions, but recent opinion again favours a production by Sophocles I at a local festival.[6]

A further very fragmentary inscription found in Rome and listing successes of tragic actors at Athens and Rhodes in the fourth century may record the production of a tetralogy of Sophocles II at the Dionysia, including an Iberians*, in the 380s or 370s.*[7]

A recently published papyrus fragment of an Achilles *is reasonably ascribed to Sophocles II (**F 2**), but apart from this no texts are known. Some fragments usually ascribed to his grandfather could be his, as could two items ascribed simply to 'Sophocles' in Stobaeus's* Anthology *and classified as* adespota *in* TrGF *2:*

(1) adesp. F 1b (Sophocles frs 97–103 Nauck[2], 101–7 Pearson): seven sententious iambic fragments attributed to 'Sophocles in Aleites'. The title is often thought to refer to Aletes, son of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra who in Hyginus, Fab. 122 took control of Mycenae when Orestes was thought to have died in the land of the Tauri and was killed by Orestes on his return. The poet was identified by Welcker, Nauck, Pearson and others as Sophocles I (»» Pearson 1917, I.62ff.), but the laborious style of the fragments and the fact that Aletes is not a known title of Sophocles I tell strongly against this. Wilamowitz rejected both the attribution to Sophocles I (or any poet of his era) and the alteration of Aleites (The Sinner) to Aletes.[8] Kannicht and Snell (*TrGF* app.) note that Sophocles II could be the author. Another candidate would be their descendant Sophocles III (*TrGF* 147, late 2nd C. BC).

(2) adesp. F 515a (= Sophocles fr. dub./spur. 1120 Pearson): twelve iambic verses attributed to 'Sophocles', apparently from near the end of a play. Someone declares that 'Everything done by the god has been done well', invites 'children' to go with him 'to the schools where the wise teach music', and exhorts them to pursue lifelong learning since, while bad conduct comes naturally, good conduct can only be learned with difficulty.

---

[6] The City Dionysia was favoured by Wilamowitz 1930, 243–46, Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 54–56 (but see the reservations of Gould and Lewis in their addenda, p. 361), Luppe 1969. Luppe 1974 suggested Sophocles II. Csapo 2010, 92, Csapo–Wilson 2015, 324, 326 and Finglass 2015, 214f. argue for a production by Sophocles I at a local festival. See now *SEHT* II.125f.

[7] *IGUR* I.223 fr. a (= *TrGF* DID A 5a; cf. Sophocles II T 7a and 8, *TrGF* II.15 and 327, *TrGF* IV.247): »» *SEHT* II.688–90, 694–97.

[8] Wilamowitz 1919, 53 n.1; 1929, 465f.

The fragment is certainly not by Sophocles I (»» Pearson 1917, III.168), possibly Sophocles II or III; or the ascription may be mistaken.

For the papyrus fragment adesp. F 679a see below under Achilles.

T 1 Suda *σ* 816

Σοφοκλῆς, Ἀρίστωνος, υἱωνὸς δὲ τοῦ προτέρου Σοφοκλέους πρεσβυτέρου, Ἀθηναῖος, τραγικός. ἐδίδαξε δὲ δράματα μ΄, οἱ δέ φασιν ια΄· νίκας δὲ εἶλεν ζ΄. ἔγραψε καὶ ἐλεγείας.

νίκας δὲ εἶλεν ζ΄, οἱ δέ φασιν ια΄ H. Clinton

T 2 *Life of Sophocles* 13 (= Iophon **T 1(c)** in Vol. 1)

T 3 Hypothesis II, Sophocles, *Oedipus Coloneus* (= *TrGF* DID C 23)

τὸν ἐπὶ Κολωνῷ Οἰδίπουν ἐπὶ τετελευτηκότι τῷ πάππῳ Σοφοκλῆς ὁ ὑϊδοῦς ἐδίδαξεν, υἱὸς ὢν Ἀρίστωνος, ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Μίκωνος, ὅς ἐστι τέταρτος ἀπὸ Καλλίου, ἐφ᾽ οὗ φασιν οἱ πλείους τὸν Σοφοκλέα τελευτῆσαι.

T 4 Diodorus Siculus 14.53.6 (= *TrGF* DID D 2, 9–11)

ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀθήναις Σοφοκλῆς ὁ Σοφοκλέους ⟨ὑϊδοῦς⟩ τραγῳδίαν διδάσκειν ἤρξατο καὶ νίκας ἔσχε δεκαδύο.

⟨ὑϊδοῦς⟩ Fritzsche ὁ Σοφοκλέους om. ms. P, del. Vogel ὁ ⟨Ἀρίστωνος τοῦ⟩ Σοφοκλέους Hoffmann

F 1 = Patrocles **F 2**

ΑΧΙΛΛΕΥΣ

The play is known only from some Hellenistic papyrus fragments now in the Ashmolean Museum which M. L. West published in 1999. These include twelve small pieces of text (frs A 1–12 = ***F 2****) from the ending of a tragedy with a subscription identifying it as 'Sophocles'* Achilles*'. No such title is known for Sophocles I, so the author is probably his grandson. These pieces were written on the reverse side of a papyrus roll, and some have on their other sides bits of a lyric lament with musical notation (frs B 1–8, ed. West 1999, 48–53, cf. Pöhlmann–West 2001, 22–25, no. 5). West suggested that these might also be from Sophocles'* Achilles*; Kannicht printed them separately as adesp. F 679a (TrGF 5.1145f.). They include only some exclamations of grief and a handful of recognizable words.*

T 1 Suda

Sophocles, son of Ariston and grandson of the preceding, elder Sophocles, Athenian, tragic poet. He produced 40 dramas, or some say 11, and won 7 victories. He also wrote elegies.

T 2 *See opposite*

T 3 Hypothesis to Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*

The *Oedipus at Colonus* was produced following his grandfather's death by his grandson Sophocles, son of Ariston, in the archonship of Micon (402/1 BC), who is the fourth after Callias (406/5 BC) in whose term most say Sophocles died.

T 4 Diodorus of Sicily, *Library of History* (on the year 397/6 BC)

In Athens, Sophocles the grandson of Sophocles began to produce tragedy and gained twelve victories.

F 1 = Patrocles **F 2**

ACHILLES

Recognizable elements in ***F 2*** *include a lyric lament (A 3), some iambic dialogue (A 5, A 7 col. ii, A 9, A 10 col. ii) involving a 'son of Poeas' (i.e. Philoctetes), and play-ending anapaests with references to Myrmidons and to souls(?) 'flying forth', above the subscription in A 12 (see on* ***F 2*** *below). West inferred that the context was the aftermath of the death of Achilles and suggested that the souls were those of Achilles and either the Ethiopian Memnon or Nestor's son Antilochus. In the epic* Aethiopis *Memnon killed Antilochus and was then killed by Achilles, who in turn was killed by Paris; Memnon's mother Dawn carried his body away to immortality, and the funerals of Antilochus and Achilles followed (Antilochus, then, seems a likelier subject than Memnon here). As for Philoctetes, West notes that he was traditionally brought from*

Lemnos to Troy some time after Achilles' death and suggests that the poet introduced him at this earlier point 'in order to foreshadow the eventual Greek success in the war', although 'it is hard to imagine how this could have been done without great awkwardness'. It would certain-

F 2 P. Ashmol. Mus. inv. 89B/29–33 (3rd–2nd C. BC), frs A 1–12, ed. West 1999, 43–48, cf. Kannicht, *TrGF* 5.1109–11.

Twelve scraps of papyrus each containing small parts of a few verses (20 in A 3*, 16 in* A 10*, 10 in* A 12*, 7 or fewer in the rest). Recognizable words include:*

A 3.14 κ]ọ̣ι̣νοπαθ̣ε̣[σ]ι̣(?) 15 ἔ̣τ̣υψ', αἰαῖ(?) 18 παπαῖ παπα[ῖ

A 10 col. ii.3 Ποίαν̣[ ]τ̣ο̣ς υ̣ἱ̣έ 4 κακὰς γὰρ ἃ̣ν̣ 5 ψυχὴ γὰρ ἤ̣θ̣ε̣λ̣' 6 — βάλλ' εἰς ὅλε̣θ̣ρ̣ο̣ν̣ 7 — Ποίαντος υἱόν

A 12.7 Μυ̣ρμιδόνω[ν 8 προπ̣τ̣όμεν̣α̣[ι? 9 ἀνάκεσμα

Below A 12.10 *(the play's last line) is the subscription:*

ΑΧΙΛΛΕΥ[Σ
ΣΟΦΟΚΛ[ΕΟΥΣ

Notes on Sophocles II

T 1

40 dramas, or some say 11, and . . . 7 victories: eleven dramas are incompatible with seven victories and a production career of at least twenty years (above, p. 54). The simplest explanation is that eleven was the number of plays that could be read in Alexandria (so e.g. Snell in *TrGF*). Clinton (1840) conjectured 'He produced 40 dramas and won 7 victories, or some say 11', but eleven victories makes a rather high success rate for forty plays, even if some of them were at the Lenaea. See below on **T 4**.

T 4

Diodorus's information was no doubt derived indirectly from the Didascaliae for the first production and the Victors List for the number of victories (he has similar entries for Sophocles I and Astydamas I: see DID D 2 in *TrGF* I^2 and Astydamas I **T 2**). The total of twelve victories however disagrees with the Suda and is (again) difficult to reconcile with its total of forty plays. Hoffmann (1951, 176 followed by Snell in *TrGF*) supposed seven victories with three plays each at the Dionysia (Suda) and five with two plays each at the Lenaea, hence 12 winning productions comprising 38 plays and a further unvictorious production at the Lenaea making the total of 40; but it seems unlikely that Sophocles won

ly have been a substantial alteration of the myth, but it might have been purposeful as Philoctetes was destined to avenge Achilles by killing his killer, Paris. ***Go to the devil!*** *in A 10.6 might be Philoctetes' first response to a suggestion that he should now enter the battle.*

F 2 Ashmolean Museum papyrus

Damaged scraps of a tragic text including lamentations for (presumably) Achilles, then a dialogue involving the son of Poeas (i.e. Philoctetes) and the play's closing lines followed by the identification of its title and author. Recognizable words include:

A 3.14 suffered/suffering together (?) 15 (he/it) struck, alas(?) 18 *papai, papai (cries of pain)*

A 10 col. ii.3 Son of Poeas . . . 4 For . . . would . . . evil . . . 5 My/his soul wanted . . . 6 — Go to the devil! 7 — . . . son of Poeas . . .

A 12.7 *(with?)* the Myrmidons 8 flying forth 9 a remedy

Subscription: SOPHOCLES' *ACHILLES*

the prize on twelve of thirteen occasions when he competed in city festivals. Müller (1985) accepted Clinton's conjecture (**T 1** n.) and argued that the younger Sophocles must have won the prize several times with revivals of his grandfather's plays; confusion over these would explain the differing transmitted figures for both Sophocles I (18 Dionysia victories in the Victors List and Diodorus, 24 in the Suda) and Sophocles II. As Müller admitted, however, there is no evidence that competitive revivals of Sophocles I's plays were ever allowed at the city festivals. The likeliest inference from all this is that the number in Diodorus is corrupt.

F 2

West (1999, 48) offers a tentative restoration of the play's closing lines (A 12.7–10): καὶ σώματα μὲν πε]δὰ Μυρμιδόνω[ν | κτεριῶ· ψυχαὶ] μὰν προπτόμενα[ι | πλάκας αἰθερ]ί{ν}ας ἀνάκεσμα τ[ύχης | θνητῆς ἔξουσ]ι μ[ά]καιραι, 'Their bodies I with the Myrmidons will commit to burial; but their souls will fly forth to the realms of aether and there possess in blessedness a remedy for their mortal misfortune.' Tragedies often end with a burial announcement (»» Collard–Cropp–Lee 2009, 191 on Eur. *Erechtheus* F 370.67–8, and on 71–72 for the topic 'bodies to earth, souls to aether').

CARCINUS II
(*TrGF* 70)

Texts etc. *TrGF* 1[2].210–15 with *addenda* 1[2].353, 5.1111; *MusTr* 146–55, 288f.

Discussions. Welcker 1841, 1060–67; Hoffmann 1951, 176–79 (chronology); Webster 1954, 300f.; Wright 2016a, 107–15; Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 38–47; *SEHT* II.365–69. See also below under *Medea*.

*The younger Carcinus has been mentioned in connection with his father Xenocles and grandfather Carcinus, both tragedians themselves (Vol. 1, pp. 134f.). He was probably born between 420 and 415. The Suda (**T 1**) has him in his prime in the 100th Olympiad (380/79–377/6), and the source of **F 6** implies that he was an established tragedian before the death of Lysias around 380. The Victors Lists inscription probably gives a first Dionysia victory shortly before 372 and a total of eleven victories,*[1] *and the Didascaliae inscription a possible Lenaea production about 376.*[2] ***T 3*** *puts him in Syracuse at the court of Dionysius II (r. 367–357), and **F 5** may imply visits to Dionysius I as well. He is not listed in the extant records of the Athenian Dionysia productions of 342–340, when he was probably dead or at least no longer active.*[3] *For the Suda's*

[1] *IG* II[2] 2325.43, Millis–Olson p. 145 (= *TrGF* DID A 3a.43): this has]νος ΔΙ (the numeral 11) immediately before the better preserved entry for Astydamas II, whose first Dionysia victory was in 372 (above, p. 24). This and the Didascaliae entry (next note) are Carcinus II T 2 in *TrGF* 1[2].

[2] *SEG* 26, 203 col. I.12, Millis–Olson p. 120 (cf. DID A 2b *addendum*, *TrGF* I[2].342 with 5.1115). Only]νος is preserved.

[3] Cf. Hoffmann 1951, 179. The Didascaliae inscription names the competing poets in 341 and 340. For 342 the Fasti inscription has a lacuna too long for the name Carcinus. Hoffmann adds that an inscribed inventory of the Treasurers of Athena from the 330s lists a damaged *palladion* (a small image of Athena) dedicated by 'Carcinus of Th[orikos]' (*IG* II[2] 1489.67–69: »» Kosmetatou 2003a). Hoffmann assumed this was Carcinus II and inferred that he had probably died some time before since otherwise he would have had the image repaired. That is a rather optimistic assumption, and the dedicator could equally have been Carcinus I (cf. his T 7 in *TrGF*).

numbers for plays and victories see below on ***T 1****. Beyond that there is no information about his production career except for the titles (stated or inferred) of ten or eleven plays and the few details provided by their testimonia and fragments. It is notable that Aristotle picked examples from five of his plays, even if his comments in the* Poetics *are critical (see below on* Aerope *and* Amphiaraus*); the ethical or rhetorical comments on* Alope, Medea *and* Oedipus *are more positive. The evidence suggests that Carcinus was one of the leading tragic poets of his generation, as does Plutarch's mention of* Aerope *(see below). We can assume that by 'Carcinus' later writers mean Carcinus II.*

*It is difficult to assess the character and quality of Carcinus's tragedies, or how he came to be contrasted with Euripides as a 'bad poet' in the tradition represented by Philodemus (****T 7****). The young Wilamowitz accused him of 'aping' Euripides because of his frequent use of Euripidean subjects,*[4] *but reworking mythical subjects was normal tragic practice: all of Carcinus's known titles and most of those of Astydamas and Theodectas are shared with one or more of the three fifth-century masters.*[5] *The more interesting question is how the poets handled the traditional mythical material and differentiated themselves from their predecessors. In this respect our information, limited and selective as it is, suggests that Carcinus was a notably original dramatist, reshaping inherited myths and characters into more morally and emotionally acceptable forms (see below on* Alope *and* Medea*) and favouring plots which highlighted rhetorical confrontation and striking persuasive argument (*Ajax, Alope, Medea, Oedipus, Orestes*). His language is sometimes derivative (in* ***F 3****,* ***F 5****,* ***F 6****, for example), but this again is expected in a poetic tradition in which conspicuous and creative variation was a virtue.*

[4] Wilamowitz 1875, 199 n. 1, '*Carcinus simia Euripidis dici potest*'; cf. 1926, 286, 'Karkinos scheint ein Vertreter des Euripides gewesen zu sein'.

[5] The selection may be a little skewed, the relevant titles belonging to plays that continued to be read in later antiquity because they could be compared with the fifth-century classics.

T 1 Suda *κ* 394

Καρκίνος, Ἀκραγαντῖνος, τραγικός. καὶ Καρκίνος, Θεοδέκτου ἢ Ξενοκλέους, Ἀθηναῖος, τραγικός. δράματα ἐδίδαξεν ρξ΄, ἐνίκησε δὲ ⟨ι⟩α΄. ἤκμαζε κατὰ τὴν ρ΄ Ὀλυμπιάδα, πρὸ τῆς Φιλίππου βασιλείας τοῦ Μακεδόνος. τῶν δραμάτων αὐτοῦ ἐστιν Ἀχιλλεύς, Σεμέλη, ἧς ἀρχὴ ⟨Ὦ *νύκτες*⟩, ὡς Ἀθήναιός φησιν ἐν Δειπνοσοφισταῖς.

2 ⟨ι⟩α΄ Köhler (ΔΙ *IG* II^2 2325.43) 4 ἧς ἀρχή Ὦ *νύκτες* Athenaeus (see **F 2–3**) ἣ ἀρχή Suda

T 3 Diogenes Laertius 2.63

φησὶ δὲ Πολύκριτος ὁ Μενδαῖος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Περὶ Διονύσιον ἄχρι τῆς ἐκπτώσεως συμβιῶναι αὐτὸν (*sc.* Αἰσχίνην) τῷ τυράννῳ καὶ ἕως τῆς Δίωνος εἰς Συρακούσας καθόδου, λέγων εἶναι σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ Καρκίνον τὸν κωμῳδοποιόν.

T 4 *See* **F 5** *below.*

T 5 *See* **F 1** *below.*

T 7 Philodemus, *On Poems* 2, cols. 207.22–208.15 (P.Herc. 994 cols 24.22–25.15), ed. Janko 2020

προσπυθοίμην δ' ἂν ἔτι τἀνθρώπου πῶς, τοὺς ἤχους οἰόμενος αὐτῶν τῶν γραμμάτων ἐν τα[ῖς] συμπάσ̣α̣ι̣ς̣ [αἰ]τίας [εἶναι τῶν] φα[ντασιῶν, ὡς καὶ τὸ δο]ῦν̣[αι το]ῖ̣[ς φυομέ]ν̣[οι]ς εὐηχε[ῖ]ν τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἡμῖν, ὑπελάμβανε κατ̣ὰ̣ τ̣ὸ̣ συνέχ̣ο̣ν̣ καὶ κυριώτατο̣ν̣ τῶν ἐν ποητ̣ι̣κῆι διαφέρειν Χοιρίλον καὶ Ἀναξιμένην Ὁμήρου, καὶ Καρκίνον καὶ Κλεα[ί]νετο̣ν̣ Εὐ̣ριπίδου, καὶ τ̣ο̣ὺ̣ς̣ ἄλλ̣ο̣υ̣[ς] τοὺς πονηροὺς ἐν ποητικῆι τῶν ἀρ̣ί̣[στω]ν̣;

ΑΕΡΟΠΗ

Nothing is known for certain except that this is named as a notable play along with Astydamas's Hector *by Plutarch (Astydamas II* ***F 1(h)****). For the relevant myth and plays by Euripides and Agathon see Vol. 1, p. 143 n. 8. Two possible references are cited in TrGF as Carcinus II F 1. (1) 'Stars like those in Carcinus's* Thyestes*' are one of Aristotle's examples of birthmarks used as recognition devices, in this case the mark identifying Pelops' descendants (cf. above, p. 32 with note 11 on Astydamas's* Antigone*). A* Thyestes *by Carcinus is not otherwise known and could be identical with his* Aerope*, but for such a prolific playwright*

T 1 Suda

Carcinus of Acragas, tragedian. Also Carcinus son of Theodectes or Xenocles, tragedian. He produced 160 plays and won ⟨1⟩1 victories. He was in his prime in the 100th Olympiad (380/79–377/6 BC), before the reign of Philip the Macedonian. Amongst his plays are *Achilles*, *Semele*, whose beginning (is) ⟨*O nights*⟩, as Athenaeus says in *Sophists at Dinner*.

T 3 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers, Aeschines of Sphettos*

Polycritus of Mende in Book 1 of his *On Dionysius* (*FGrH* 559 F 1) says that he (i.e. Aeschines) lived with the tyrant (i.e. Dionysius II) until the latter's fall from power and Dion's return to Syracuse (357 BC), saying that Carcinus the comic poet was with him (i.e. Dionysius) as well.

T 4 *See* **F 5** *below*

T 5 *See* **F 1** *below*

T 7 Philodemus, *On Poems*, Book 2

And I would inquire further of the fellow, how it is that, while thinking that in all [*sc.* poetic compositions) the sounds of the letters themselves *(are) the causes (of representations,*[6] *as also that we award)* preeminence *(to those [*sc. *poets] who naturally)* sound well to us, he assumed that in terms of what is essential and most important in poetic art Choerilus and Anaximenes differ from Homer, and Carcinus and Cleaenetus from Euripides, and all the others who are bad in poetic art from the best ones.

AEROPE

*that is far from certain. (2) Aelian (*Historical Miscellany *14.40) tells a probably apocryphal story in which the pitiless tyrant Alexander of Pherae (d. 358 BC) wept at an actor's heart-rending performance as Aerope; he names neither play nor author and we could equally well think of Euripides'* Cretan Women*. Plutarch tells the same story with reference to Euripides'* Trojan Women *(*Pelopidas *29.9,* Moralia *334a).*[7]

---

[6] φαντασίαι, the hearer's imaginative responses evoked by the poet's words; cf. Watson 1988, 43.

[7] Cf. *SEHT* II.536, 586ff. with comment on the story's implausibility. Valckenaer's arbitrary alteration of Ἀερόπην to Μερόπην (1767, 182) is printed there as by Dilts in his 1972 Teubner edition.

ΑΙΑΣ

The subject must have been the famous debate over the award of Achilles' armour which was narrated in the Little Iliad *(see Proclus's summary with F 2 in* GEF*; cf.* Odyssey *11.541–64). According to* ***F 1a****, an actor named Pleisthenes while playing the role of Ajax in Carcinus's play laughed spontaneously as Odysseus argued that the arms should justly be awarded to himself.*[8] *Ajax's laughter was more often associated with the madness in which he thought he was killing Odysseus and the Atreidai, e.g. in Sophocles'* Ajax *301–4 and the proverb tradition (Zenobius 1.43 etc.).*

Aeschylus dramatized the dispute and Ajax's madness and suicide in two distinct plays, The Arms Judgment *(*Hoplôn Krisis*, F 174–8) and* Thracian Women *(*Thrêissai*, F 83–85), which probably formed a trilogy*

F 1a Zenobius Athous 1.60

Αἰάντειος γέλως· μέμνηται ταύτης Μένανδρος ἐν Περινθίᾳ τῇ πρώτῃ· λέγουσι δὲ ὅτι Πλεισθένης ὁ ὑποκριτὴς τὸν Καρκίνου Αἴαντα ὑποκρινόμενος εὐκαίρως ἐγέλασε· τοῦ γὰρ Ὀδυσσέως εἰπόντος ὅτι τὰ δίκαια χρῆ ποιεῖν μετὰ εἰρωνείας ὁ Αἴας γέλωτι ἐχρήσατο.

ΑΛΟΠΗ

The story of Alope, mother of the Athenian tribal hero Hippothoon, was dramatized before Carcinus by Choerilus and Euripides (see on Choerilus ***F 1*** *in Vol. 1). In Hyginus,* Fab*. 187 and probably in the earlier tragedies, Cercyon killed his daughter Alope when he found she had given birth, but the child, protected by his father Poseidon, survived exposure and grew up to achieve his heroic destiny. In the standard Athenian mythology Cercyon was one of the villains whom Theseus killed on his way from Troezen to Athens, and that episode is attached to the Alope story at least in Hyginus's summary. Aristotle and an anonymous commentary on the* Nicomachean Ethics*, cited together as* ***F 1b****, provide*

[8] The actor might have been the [Pl]eisthenes named in the Victors List as winning an acting prize at the City Dionysia towards the end of the fourth century (*IG* II^2 2325.36, Millis–Olson p. 153; Stephanis no. 2069). If so, the relevant production of Carcinus's *Ajax* was probably a revival.

AJAX

with Women of Salamis *(*Salaminiai*, F 216–20, about his half-brother Teucer's return to Salamis: see on Ion's* Teucer *in Vol. 1). Sophocles'* Ajax *is focused on the madness and suicide, as presumably was Astydamas'* Mad Ajax *(Astydamas II* ***T 1****). **F 1a** shows that Carcinus's tragedy included the debate (**F 1a**), but the title* Ajax *suggests that it may have included the madness and suicide as well. The same can be said of Theodectas's* Ajax *(below, pp. 136f.). Ennius's Latin* Ajax *may have been based on Sophocles, while the Latin* Arms Judgment*s of Pacuvius and Accius seem to have spanned both the Judgment and the suicide.*[9]

By Carcinus's time the debate was well established as a rhetorical topic: see further below on Theodectas's Ajax.

F 1a Zenobius, *Proverbs*

Ajax's laughter: Menander mentions this in his first *Woman of Perinthus* (fr. 9 Körte, 10 Austin). They say that the actor Pleisthenes when playing Carcinus's Ajax laughed at an appropriate moment: when Odysseus said that one should do what is just, Ajax laughed ironically.

ALOPE

our only in formation about Carcinus's play.[10] *It shows that Carcinus radically altered the tradition so that Cercyon persuaded Alope to reveal the identity of her debaucher, promising to accept the grief and shame of it, but then struggled to do so and was driven to kill himself.*[11] *The main*

---

[9] For Ennius see Jocelyn 1972, 177ff., Goldberg–Manuwald 2018, 12f., and for Pacuvius Schierl 2006, 131–61 (suggesting on pp. 136f. that Pacuvius omitted the madness and the debate over Ajax's burial). Accius's fragments suggest that he included both the Judgment and the madness and suicide with its aftermath (Dangel 2002, 300–6).

[10] Two other commentaries merely paraphrase Aristotle: Aspasius in *CAG* vol. 19.1, p. 133 ('Apparently Carcinus brings in Cercyon being overcome by great griefs') and 'Heliodorus' in *CAG* 19.2.22–24, p. 149 ('Cercyon, whom the poet Carcinus brings in as bearing his daughter Alope's violation bravely up to a point but then having been overcome by the grief of it').

[11] Stephanopoulos 1984, 183 notes a suggestion of Dirlmeier that the Aristotle commentary might imply that Cercyon finally resolved to kill Alope rather than

purpose of the change was presumably to make a more morally acceptable tragedy by eliminating Cercyon's killing of his own daughter and focusing on his unsuccessful struggle to come to terms with her disgrace (cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 36–38, Karamanou 2019, 43–46). The change also conveniently removed the need for the later conflict in which Theseus killed Cercyon (who was after all the grandfather of an Athenian tribal hero). Carcinus probably retained the fact that Alope's debaucher was Poseidon, but if Cercyon knew that his grandson was the son of a god it is difficult to see why he should have been driven to

F 1b

(a) Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1150b9ff.

ὁμοίως δ' ἔχει καὶ περὶ ἐγκράτειαν καὶ ἀκρασίαν. οὐ γὰρ εἴ τις ἰσχυρῶν καὶ ὑπερβαλλουσῶν ἡδονῶν ἡττᾶται ἢ λυπῶν, θαυμαστόν, ἀλλὰ συγγνωμονικὸν εἰ ἀντιτείνων, ὥσπερ ὁ Θεοδέκτου Φιλοκτήτης ὑπὸ τοῦ ἕχεως πεπληγμένος ἢ ὁ Καρκίνου ἐν τῇ Ἀλόπῃ Κερκύων . . .

(b) Anon. comm. *ad loc., CAG* vol. 20, p. 437

καὶ ὁ Καρκίνος τραγικὸς ἦν, ὁ δὲ Κερκύων εἶχε θυγατέρα τὴν Ἀλόπην. μαθὼν δὲ ὅτι ἐμοιχεύθη ἡ αὐτοῦ θυγάτηρ Ἀλόπη ἠρώτησεν αὐτήν, τίς ἦν ὁ μοιχεύσας, λέγων 'εἴ μοι τοῦτον εἴποις, οὐδ' ὅλως ἂν λυπηθῶ'. εἶτα εἰπούσης τῆς Ἀλόπης τὸν αὐτὴν μοιχεύσαντα, οὐκέτι ὁ Κερκύων ὑπὸ τῆς λύπης ἔφερε ζῆν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ζῆν ἀπελέγετο.

3 λυπηθῶ or λυπηθῇς mss.

himself. The suggestion misconstrues the commentator's Greek, and Cercyon's killing Alope would be an inept example of someone understandably succumbing to extreme grief as Aristotle's argument requires. Welcker (1841, 1064f.) suggested that Cercyon might have declared that he would kill himself and then thought better of it, but this again is inconsistent with Aristotle's argument.

suicide. Welcker (1841, 1064f.) noted that if Poseidon was Cercyon's father in this play, as in Choerilus's, that would make his union with Alope incestuous, and Karamanou suggests that Cercyon might have been humiliated by his inability to avenge his daughter's rape because the rapist was a god. Neither of these explanations is very convincing, and it may be that the summary in ***F 1b(b)*** *omits some crucial detail, for instance that Cercyon learned of the seducer's identity after ordering the child's exposure and assumed he was dead.*[12]

F 1b

(a) Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*

The same holds for self-control and lack of self-control. It is not surprising if someone succumbs to overwhelming pleasures or griefs; on the contrary, it is understandable if he does this while striving against them, as does Theodectas's Philoctetes wounded by the snake (Theodectas **F 5b**) or Carcinus's Cercyon in his *Alope* . . .

(b) Anonymous commentary on the above, after explanation of Theodectas **F 5b**

Carcinus too was a tragedian, and Cercyon had a daughter, Alope. Learning that his daughter Alope had been debauched he asked her who it was who had debauched her, saying, 'If you told me this I would not be wholly grieved'. Then, when Alope told him who had debauched her, Cercyon because of his grief could no longer bear to live but actually renounced life.

[12] Or did Carcinus make Theseus the father? The 3rd-century historian Istros listed a daughter of Cercyon, presumably Alope, amongst girls abducted by Theseus (Istros F 10 *FGrH*, whence Plutarch, *Theseus* 29). Karamanou suggests that Carcinus might have omitted Alope's pregnancy and the birth of Hippothoon altogether, but without those the whole story is pointless.

ΑΜΦΙΑΡΕΩΣ(?)

*The play was clearly a tragedy since Aristotle mentions it as an example of tragic composition (**F 1c**). The likeliest subject is the betrayal of the seer Amphiaraus by his wife Eriphyle, who sent him to his death with the Seven against Thebes. The episode and its consequences were popular subjects for tragedies (cf. pp. 28f. above on Astydamas's* Alcmeon*), probably including Sophocles'* Eriphyle*; if it was Carcinus's subject, his title could have been* Eriphyle *rather than* Amphiaraus*. An* Amphiaraus

F 1c Aristotle, *Poetics* 1455a22–29

δεῖ δὲ τοὺς μύθους συνιστάναι καὶ τῇ λέξει συναπεργάζεσθαι ὅτι μάλιστα πρὸ ὀμμάτων τιθέμενον· οὕτω γὰρ ἂν ἐναργέστατα ὁρῶν ὥσπερ παρ' αὐτοῖς γιγνόμενος τοῖς πραττομένοις εὑρίσκοι τὸ πρέπον καὶ ἥκιστα ἂν λανθάνοι τὰ ὑπεναντία. σημεῖον δὲ τούτου ὃ ἐπετιμᾶτο Καρκίνῳ. ὁ γὰρ Ἀμφιάραος ἐξ ἱεροῦ ἀνῄει, ὃ μὴ ὁρῶντα [τὸν θεατὴν] ἐλάνθανεν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐξέπεσεν δυσχερανάντων τοῦτο τῶν θεατῶν.

τὸν θεατὴν del. Butcher

ΑΧΙΛΛΕΥΣ

A single contextless fragment. Amongst many possible subjects for the play the most obvious is the death of Patroclus and Achilles' reaction to it, as in Aeschylus's Myrmidons *and probably Aristarchus's* Achilles *(Vol. 1, p. 60). The 'deep hollow encircling the host' is presumably the 'deep trench' (βαθεῖα τάφρος,* Il. *7.341, 440, 8.336) which protects the Achaeans' camp and ships and figures prominently in the* Iliad*'s battle*

F 1d Athenaeus 5.189d

καλοῦσι δ' ἀρσενικῶς τοὺς αὐλῶνας, ὥσπερ Θουκυδίδης ἐν τῇ δ΄ καὶ πάντες οἱ καταλογάδην συγγραφεῖς, οἱ δὲ ποιηταὶ θηλυκῶς· Καρκίνος μὲν Ἀχιλλεῖ,

βαθεῖαν εἰς αὐλῶνα περίδρομον στρατοῦ

καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Σκύθαις . . .

AMPHIARAUS(?)

by Cleophon (or Iophon: see on Iophon ***T 1*** *in Vol. 1) is known only by its title. Sophocles produced a satyric* Amphiaraus*, and there were comedies by Aristophanes (set at the sanctuary of Amphiaraus at Oropos) and the New Comedy poets Philippides and Apollodorus of Carystus. The details of Carcinus's error and its implications for the play's plot can only be guessed: see the note on* ***F 1c*** *below.*

F 1c Aristotle, *Poetics*

One should construct one's plots and bring them to completion along with the script while putting them before one's eyes as much as possible; in this way one will see the events most clearly, as if one were actually present at them, and so find what is appropriate and not fail to notice things that are inappropriate. An indication of this is what Carcinus was criticized for. Amphiaraus was coming back out of the temple; the poet, not seeing this, overlooked it, but on the stage it fell flat because the audience objected to it.

ACHILLES

scenes, especially the Trojan assault which Achilles ultimately repels.[13] *A fragmentary papyrus text (P. Köln 6.241 = adesp. F 640b in* TrGF *5.1131–34) contains parts of a tragedy on this subject which could be from the* Achilles *of Carcinus or Aristarchus, or others with this title by Iophon, Astydamas and Euaretus.*

F 1d Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*

Some make *aulônes* ('hollows') masculine, for example Thucydides in Book 4 (4.103) and all writers in prose, whereas poets make them feminine: Carcinus in *Achilles*,

> Into the deep hollow encircling the host,

and Sophocles in *Scythians* . . . (F 549) . . .

[13] αὐλών is a synonym for τάφρος in Aesch. F 419 and *Rhesus* 111f. (τάφρους ὑπερβὰς . . . καίτοι περάσας κοῖλον αὐλώνων βάθος . . . : cf. Fantuzzi *ad loc)*.

ΘΥΕΣΤΗΣ(?)

See above under Aerope.

ΜΗΔΕΙΑ

Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 35f., 69; 2017, 222–28; Burkert 2009; Lucarini 2013, 193–96; Taplin 2014, 149–53; Zouganeli 2017, 80–87; Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 42f. See also below under **F 1e *add***.

Medea, like Oedipus, was a popular subject for dramatists.[14] *Besides the extant* Medea *of Euripides and the fragments of Neophron's* Medea *(in Vol. 1) we know of tragedies by Euripides II (**T 1**: Vol. 1), Dicaeogenes (**F 1a**), Theodorides (*TrGF *no. 78a), and Diogenes of Sinope (**F 1e**). The subject is also well represented in fourth-century vase-painting (see below). Carcinus's play was until recently known only from Aristotle's comment (**F 1e**), which indicates that in it Medea, rather than killing her sons as in Euripides' play, sent them away (presumably to protect them) and thus left herself open to the accusation that she had killed them. This is now complemented by the Louvre papyrus (**F 1e add.**), which contains part of an extract from the play prepared for musical performance in the first or second century AD (see notes below for details: the text coincides so closely with Aristotle's description that attribution to Carcinus is hardly in doubt). In the papyrus text Jason challenges Medea to prove her innocence by producing the missing boys,*[15] *Medea protests that she would never have killed her own offspring and in fact has sent them away from Corinth with their nurse, and a third speaker (perhaps Creon) insists that she has killed them just as she has killed Glauce and should be put to death; Medea then responds with what looks like a complaint about the prejudice she suffers as a barbarian.*

Carcinus's plot thus seems to have had the same basis as Euripides': Jason brought Medea to Corinth and then deserted her for the princess Glauce, and Medea retaliated by causing Glauce's death

[14] Concise surveys in Mastronarde 2002, 64–70, Wright 2020, 217–35.

[15] Siron 2018 points out that this reflects real lawcourt situations where defendants dramatically produced people they were accused of having murdered, e.g. Isocrates 18.52–4.

THYESTES(?)

See above under Aerope.

MEDEA

'with fire' (presumably the fiery headdress and robe of Eur. Med. *1186ff.). In Carcinus's play, however, Medea has not planned to punish Jason by killing their sons but rather has sent them away for their own safety. It is not clear whether she has done this before or after sending the deadly gifts to Glauce. If before, that would differ substantially from Euripides' plot, in which the boys bring the gifts to the princess and play a crucial part in persuading her to accept them (*Med. *969–73, 1002–04, 1149–55), and are thus put at risk of being killed themselves by her relatives (*Med. *1236–41, 1301–05). If after, the plot could have followed Euripides up to the point when the boys return from delivering the gifts (Eur.* Med. *1002) and then substituted their concealment for the child-murder which the audience might have expected. The elimination of the child-murder and a less savage character for Medea are in any case generally recognized as defining features of Carcinus's design. The outcome is however unclear since Medea may have succeeded only in leaving the children at the mercy of her enemies: this would align Carcinus's plot with those versions of the myth in which the Corinthians themselves killed the children,*[16] *and would mean that it involved a truly tragic error rather than the merely tactical one that Aristotle seems to imply. On the other hand, the reading γῆς ἔξω, 'outside of this land' in the papyrus (line 6) suggests that they may really have escaped (and even without this reading the fact that Medea cannot produce them suggests they are no longer in Corinth). We can assume that Medea her-*

[16] The deaths and burials of the children in the Corinthian sanctuary of Hera Akraia seem to have been a basic feature of the myth. In different accounts Medea buried them there herself in the hope of making them immortal, or the Corinthians plotted against her and killed them as they took refuge in the sanctuary (thus incurring a plague and expiatory rituals), or she killed Creon and fled to Athens leaving the children in the sanctuary for safety, and Creon's relatives killed them there and blamed the sacrilege on her. Euripides probably invented Medea's revenge-killing of her own sons while retaining the burials in the sanctuary and consequent rituals (*Med.* 1378–83): »» e.g. Gantz, 1993, 368–70, Mastronarde 2002, 50–53, West 2007, 5f. = 2013a, 341f., Burkert 2009.

self escaped as she always did, but an escape for the children would amount to a radical refashioning of the myth.

West (2007, 5–7) suggested a different reconstruction in which Jason has previously sent the children to live in the royal palace, Medea plans to kill Glauce and has the children abducted so as to protect them, and Glauce discovers her plan and kills the children before being killed herself by Medea. This is based on a late commentator's explanation of Aristotle's remarks, but the commentator clearly knew nothing about Carcinus's play and was merely trying to explain Aristotle in light of the Euripidean plot: see further on ***F 1e*** *below.*

Versions of the story are depicted on a number of South Italian vases,[17] *but most show Medea killing her sons or escaping on her Sun-chariot after killing them, and so cannot be connected with Carcinus's play. An Apulian vase from the 350s showing the princess trying vainly to remove the fiery headdress while a paidagogos shepherds the two boys away is reminiscent of Euripides' messenger-speech.*[18] *One other vase, a fine Apulian crater from the 330s published in 1984, has been considered.*[19] *It shows Medea (named) and a 'paidagogos' figure (often suggestive of tragedy) conversing in an* aedicula *labelled 'Eleusis, the sanctuary'. In the foreground two boys are seated on an altar, unnamed but presumably Medea's sons. The central figures are surrounded by other pairs: Athena and Nikê upper left, Demeter and Korê upper right, youths with mystic torches lower left, Heracles and Iris lower right. Giu-*

F 1e Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1400b9ff.[20]

ἄλλος τόπος τὸ ἐκ τῶν ἁμαρτηθέντων κατηγορεῖν ἢ ἀπολογεῖσθαι, οἷον ἐν τῇ Καρκίνου Μηδείᾳ οἱ μὲν κατηγοροῦσιν ὅτι τοὺς παῖδας ἀπέκτεινεν, οὐ φαίνεσθαι γοῦν αὐτούς· ἥμαρτε γὰρ ἡ Μήδεια περὶ τὴν ἀποστολὴν τῶν παίδων· ἡ δ' ἀπολογεῖται ὅτι οὐκ ἂν τοὺς παῖδας ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰάσονα ἂν ἀπέκτεινεν· τοῦτο γὰρ ἥμαρτεν ἂν μὴ ποιήσασα, εἴπερ καὶ θάτερον ἐποίησεν.

---

[17] See *LIMC* VI, 'Medeia' nos 29–39, 68; Mastronarde 2002, 66–69; Taplin 2007, 114–25, 238–40, 255–57 with notes.

[18] *LIMC* VI, 'Kreousa II', no. 16; Taplin no. 33, Mastronarde 68, n. 114.

[19] *LIMC* 'Medeia' no. 68, Taplin no. 94, pp. 238–40; published by Trendall 1984; cf. *TrGF* 5, p. 1111. See also Giuliani–Most 2007, Taplin 2014, 149–53 with 155 n. 41.

[20] The anonymous commentator's explanation of Aristotle's point which Snell printed as **F 1e II** is irrelevant. See note on **F 1e** below.

liani and Most, building on Trendall's interpretation, suggest that the vase might represent a play in which Medea brought her sons to Eleusis before proceeding to Athens and securing protection for the boys, with divine support, against a Corinthian attempt at vengeance. This is of course highly speculative, and a Medea *set at Eleusis could hardly be Carcinus's* Medea *with its confronation between Medea and her accusers. Giuliani and Most leave the question of authorship open, but Taplin (2014) suggests that the vase could be linked with Carcinus's play if that play was set partly at Corinth and later at Eleusis. Such a change of scene is not impossible, but it is unlikely and perhaps not needed: the vase could sum up the outcome of a play set at Corinth which ended with an escape to Eleusis. There are however other difficulties. The papyrus's τροφός (line 6) cannot be the vase's paidagogos since the word regularly denotes a female nurse.*[21] *And if Medea and her sons have reached Eleusis safely she has not made a mistake in sending them away as Aristotle's comment indicates. So while the vase may reflect an innovative tragic version of the myth, this does not seem to be Carcinus's version. For other objections see Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 43.*[22]

A papyrus fragment from the second century AD (adesp. F 701) has parts of a few lyric lines in which Jason's betrayal of Medea is lamented by a chorus or an unidentified character, and possibly by Medea herself. They could be from Carcinus's play.

F 1e Aristotle, *Rhetoric*

Another kind of argument is the use of mistakes as a basis for accusation or defence: for example, in Carcinus's *Medea* the accusers claim that she has killed her sons, or at any rate that they are nowhere to be seen (for Medea made a mistake in the sending away of the sons), and she replies in her defence that she would have killed, not her sons, but Jason (for she would have made a mistake in not killing him if in fact she had done the other thing).

[21] The male equivalent is τροφεύς. In the two instances where the word τροφός refers to a male there are special reasons that do not apply here: see e.g. Bond 1981, 73 on Eur. *HF* 45.

[22] Lamari 2017, 134 suggests that the vase 'might have reflected the painter's own response to the Euripidean version of the myth'.

F 1e *add.* P. Louvre inv. E 10534 (2nd C. AD), ed. Bélis 2004, re-ed. West 2007 (revised in 2013a, 334–50), Martinelli 2010; colour photo, Csapo *et al.* 2014, 453 pl. 5.2. Musical notations above lines 3–5 and 13–17 (3–5 and 12–15 of the papyrus) are omitted here.

(Ιασ.) εἰ δ’]θ’ ὡ[ς] φὴς παῖδας οὐκ ἀπέκτανες,
] σ̣εαυτήν, δεῖξον οὓς οὐκ ὤλεσ̣α̣ς̣.
Μηδ. τέκ]ν̣α̣ σοὶ τεκοῦσ’ ἐπόμνυμαι
Σ̣κ̣υ̣θ̣ι̣κ̣ὴν̣ ̣[ ]ν ὡς οὐκ ὤλεσα
οὓς ἔτεκον α̣ὐ̣τ̣ὴ παῖ[δας]αν
α̣π̣ . . . π̣ιστεύσασα γῆ̣ς ἔ̣ξω τροφῶ(ι).
Κρε.? *a few traces* ἡ ἀσ[έ]βεια Μηδείας· κ . . . .
a few traces ὤλεσεν Γλαύκην̣ π̣υρί
a few traces σ̣α̣ Κολχίς· ὁμολογεῖ τάδε·
] ἔ̣δρ̣α̣[σ]εν, ἔκτειν̣εν τέκ̣[ν]α̣.
] τ̣ί̣ μέλ̣λ̣εις πρὸς φόνους τὴν βάρβαρον
ἄγει]ν; ἔχεις, Ἰᾶ[σ]ον· ὡς βούλει κτάνε.
Μηδ. *a few traces* ρσε[̣]χον κ̣όρης
Ἕλληνες *a few traces* ου μηδεὶς Σκυθῶν,
μ̣ά̣ταια με[ ]ν . .
λ̣έ̣γ̣ο̣ντ̣[ε]ς̣, ἡ δὲ βαρβάρου σ̣[
traces of one more line

1 εἰ δ’ West ἀπέκτανες Kannicht ἀπέκτεινας P. Louvre ἀπέκτονας West 2 ῥῦσαι] West σῶσον] Martinelli 3 ἄριστα τέκ]νά West 2013 4 μ[εγίστην δαίμο]ν’ West (-ον̣ μ[έγιστον ὅρκο]ν Burkert) ἐ̣[μὴν δέσποινα]ν Ferrari *ap.* Martinelli) 5–6 εἰς δ’ ἀσυλί]αν | ἀπ[ῆ]ρ̣α̣ West 2007 ἐξέπεμψα δέ] | ανα̣π̣. . . West 2013 6 γῆ̣ς ἔ̣ξω read by Ferrari γηραιῶι conj. West 2007 (‘certainly not what was written’) 7 δήλη ’στὶ]ν West 2007 τ̣ω̣. [. .]. [ ]α̣ν̣ West 2013 κ̣α̣κ̣ὴ̣ς West 2007 κ . . τ̣ο̣[Zouganeli 8 × –]τον [ἔ]κ̣τ̣ειν̣’ Martinelli (κ̣τ̣ειν̣ε̣ read by Pernigotti) ἢ πρῶ]τον [ἔ]κ̣τ̣ειν̣’ Ferrari 9] π̣α̣ρ̣ο̣ῦ̣σ̣α̣ Bélis, Martinelli (αὐτὴ] π̣α̣ρ̣ο̣ῦ̣σ̣α̣ Ferrari) χολκὶς P. Louvre 10 καὶ τοῦτο δῆτ’] West ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦτ’] Ferrari 11 εἶέν] West 11–12 τί μέλλεις . . . | ἄγει]ν; Stephanopoulos τί μέλλεις; . . . | ἄγει]ν ἔχεις West (κρίνει]ν Luppe, ἑλὼ]ν Burkert) × –] τί μέλλεις . . . τὴν βάρβαρον; Martinelli (then δίκη]ν ἔχεις Ferrari, αὐτὴ]ν ἔχεις Battezzato) 14–16 verse-divisions West (15–16 μηδεὶς Σκυθῶν μ̣ά̣ταια με[⏑ – ⏑ – | × – ⏑ – λ̣έ̣γ̣ο̣ντ̣[ε]ς̣, ἡ δὲ β̣αρβάρους Martinelli) 15 μὲ[ν West 16 end σ̣[πορᾶς ἄπο West

F 1e *add.* Louvre papyrus (publ. 2004)

(Jason.) But if . . . as you claim, you did not kill the boys, *(save)* yourself, show us those whom you did not kill.

Medea. I bore you . . . *(child)*ren, and I swear to you . . . Scythian . . . that I did not kill the sons I bore myself . . . [5] . . . *outside of this land*, entrusting them to their nurse.

Creon? Medea's impiety . . . . The Colchian woman(?) . . . evil . . . destroyed Glauce with fire; she admits this . . . she did/had done *(this)*, she killed the children.[10] . . . why do you hesitate *(to take)* the barbarian woman to the slaughter? You have it in your power, Jason. Kill her as you wish!

Medea. . . . . . *(of/from your?)* daughter . . . Hellenes . . . no Scythian . . . saying vain things . . . . . while this woman of barbarian *(birth?)* . . .

ΟΙΔΙΠΟΥΣ

The play is known only from Aristotle's somewhat cryptic discussion, ***F 1f****, which has been interpreted variously but was well explained by Cooper 1929, refuting several alternatives.*[23] *As he noted, a play called* Oedipus *will have concerned an adult Oedipus, not the exposure of the infant as supposed by e.g. Webster 1954, 301, Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 45f., 2017, 228. Aristotle implies that in Carcinus's scene someone questioned Jocasta about a son she had once borne and Jocasta replied with a narrative of past events, assuring the questioner repeatedy that*

F 1f Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1417b12–20

ἐν δὲ δημηγορίᾳ ἥκιστα διήγησίς ἐστιν . . . ἀλλ' ἐάν περ διήγησις ᾖ, τῶν γενομένων ἔσται, ἵνα ἀναμνησθέντες ἐκείνων βέλτιον βουλεύσωνται περὶ τῶν ὕστερον . . . ἂν δ' ᾖ ἄπιστον, ὑπισχνεῖσθαι δεῖ καὶ αἰτίαν λέγειν εὐθὺς καὶ διατάττειν ὡς βούλονται, οἷον ἡ Ἰοκάστη ἡ Καρκίνου ἐν τῷ Οἰδίποδι ἀεὶ ὑπισχνεῖται πυνθανομένου τοῦ ζητοῦντος τὸν υἱόν, καὶ ὁ Αἵμων ὁ Σοφοκλέους.

3 δεῖ Ross τε mss. 4 ὡς Jebb οἷς mss.

ΟΡΕΣΤΗΣ

*The only testimony (****F 1g****) shows that the play concerned Orestes' trial for matricide, like those of Euripides and Theodectas. Beyond that the plot is obscure, especially as the name of Orestes' questioner cannot be safely restored. Menelaus (a character in Euripides' play) is possible.*

F 1g Pausanias Attic. *κ* 15 Erbse (= Suda *κ* 397, ~ Photius *κ* 193)

Καρκίνου ποιήματα· Μένανδρος Ψευδηρακλεῖ ἀντὶ τοῦ αἰνιγματώδη. ὁ γὰρ Καρκίνος Ὀρέστην ὑπὸ †Ἰλίου† ἀναγκαζόμενον ὁμολογῆσαι, ὅτι ἐμητροκτόνησεν, ἐποίησε δι' αἰνιγμάτων ἀποκρινόμενον.

ὑπὸ Valckenaer ἀπὸ Sud., Phot. ἰλίου Sud. ἡλίου Phot. Μενελάου Hemsterhuys Περιλάου Snell

---

[23] Cooper also shows that Aristotle's reference to Haemon is to Soph. *Ant.* 688ff., where Haemon assures his father that what he says about public opinion is true even though Creon is not aware of it. The comment on this passage in *CAG* 21.2, p. 248.25–28 is worthless (cf. above on *Medea* **F 1e)**: 'Carcinus was a tragic poet. In *Oedipus*, i.e. the drama, someone was looking for his son and enquired and asked Jocasta about him, and she continually promised to tell him. And *Haemon* is a drama, and he too continually promises the man asking him that he will tell him.'

OEDIPUS

her narrative was true though hard to believe and adding details so as to convince him. Cooper inferred that the questioner was Oedipus, and that in Carcinus's scene Jocasta was trying to persuade Oedipus not to enquire further about her exposed son as she does in Sophocles' play. It seems a little unlikely that 'the man enquiring after her son' means Oedipus, and Carcinus's play may have differed from Sophocles' more than Cooper supposed.

F 1f Aristotle, *Rhetoric*

In deliberative address narrative is very rare . . . But if there is a narrative, it will be of what has happened previously, so that by recollecting those events they (i.e. your audience) may deliberate better about the future . . . And if it is hard to believe, you should give assurances and state an explanation immediately and set it out as they require, as for example Carcinus's Jocasta in *Oedipus* repeatedly gives assurances when the man enquiring after her son questions her, and Sophocles' Haemon.

ORESTES

Perilaus, suggested by Snell, is unlikely (he is named as Orestes' accuser in a trial that took place in Arcadia in a variant of the myth mentioned by Pausanias 8.34.4). Orestes presumably answered in riddles so as to avoid admitting the awful truth plainly. On riddles in drama see on Agathon ***F 4*** *(Vol. 1, p. 174 with n. 30).*

F 1g Pausanias, *Attic Lexicon*

Carcinus's compositions: Menander in *Pseudo-Heracles* (fr. 415 *PCG*), meaning riddling ones. Carcinus made Orestes, when pressed by †*Ilios*† to admit he had killed his mother, answer in riddles.

ΣΕΜΕΛΗ

The play must have been about the birth of Dionysus, like others with this title (see on Diogenes' Semele *in Vol. 1). The fragments are quoted in a recital of misogynistic quotations mostly from comedy in Athenaeus 13.557f–560a. Identifying a play by its opening words was not unusual. The longer quotation (unconnected with the opening phrase) echoes Euripides'* Stheneboea *F 666 and might be Cadmus condemning someone complicit in his daughter's secret liaison.*

F 2–3 Athenaeus 13.559f

Καρκίνος δ' ὁ τραγικὸς ἐν Σεμέλῃ, ἧς ἀρχή

ὦ νύκτες,

φησίν·

ὦ Ζεῦ, τί χρὴ γυναῖκας ἐξειπεῖν κακόν;
ἀρκοῦν ἂν εἴη, κἂν γυναῖκ' εἴπῃς μόνον.

ΤΥΡΩ(?)

The title is confused in the manuscripts of Stobaeus, but the phrasing of the lemma makes Tyro *more likely than* Tereus.[24] *The plot will then have concerned Salmoneus's daughter Tyro, who most notably bore the twins Pelias and Neleus after a secret affair with the god Poseidon; she exposed them to die, they were saved by a herdsman, grew up in rustic surroundings, and later rescued their mother from the persecution of her stepmother Sidero. Sophocles apparently produced two plays about Tyro, of which at least one featured the rescue by her sons and revenge*

F 4 Stobaeus 4.39.3

Καρκίνου Τυροῦς·

ἀσκεῖν μὲν ἀρετήν, εὐτυχεῖν δ' αἰτεῖν θεούς·
ἔχων γὰρ ἄμφω ταῦτα μακάριός θ' ἅμα
κεκλημένος ζῆν κἀγαθὸς δυνήσεται.

Τυροῦς Nauck Τυρεύς Stob. Τηρεύς Gesner

[24] Stobaeus cites play-titles in the genitive or dative case much more often than the nominative: for Sophocles' *Tyro*, Τυροῦς 3 times, (ἐν) Τυροῖ 3 times, Τυρώ once; for his *Tereus*, Τηρέως once, (ἐν) Τηρεῖ 9 times, Τηρεύς never.

SEMELE

F 2–3 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*

And Carcinus the tragedian in *Semele*, which begins

> O nights,

says:

> O Zeus, what need is there to declare women an evil? It would be enough even if you just said ‘woman’.

TYRO(?)

on Sidero (the second may have been a revision of the first, but there were other elements of Tyro’s story that Sophocles could have dramatized: »» Gantz 1993, 171–73). Carcinus may well have reworked Sophocles’ known plot, but again that is not certain. We have only the title of Astydamas’s Tyro *(see Astydamas II* ***T 1****). The papyrus fragments P. Hibeh 3 (=* TrGF *adesp. F 626, Sophocles F 649 Pearson) might be from a* Tyro *but if so the poet is more likely Sophocles than Carcinus or Astydamas.*

F 4 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, ‘On good fortune’

From Carcinus’s *Tyro*:

> (A man should) practice virtue, and ask the gods for good fortune. With both of these he’ll be able to live and be called both blessed and good.[25]

[25] The chiasmus is notable (virtue, good fortune: blessed, good).

INCERTAE FABULAE

F 5 Diodorus Siculus 5.5.1 (= Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 164.81ff.)

περὶ δὲ τῆς κατὰ τὴν Κόρην ἁρπαγῆς ὅτι γέγονεν ὡς προειρήκαμεν, πολλοὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων συγγραφέων καὶ ποιητῶν μεμαρτυρήκασι. Καρκίνος μὲν γὰρ ὁ τῶν τραγῳδιῶν ποιητής, πλεονάκις ἐν ταῖς Συρακούσαις παρεπιδεδημηκώς, καὶ τὴν τῶν ἐγχωρίων τεθεαμένος σπουδὴν ⟨τὴν⟩ περὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ πανηγύρεις τῆς τε Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης, κατεχώρισεν ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασι τούσδε τοὺς στίχους·

λέγουσι Δήμητρός ποτ᾽ ἄρρητον κόρην
Πλούτωνα κρυφίοις ἁρπάσαι βουλεύμασι
δῦναί τε γαίας εἰς μελαμφαεῖς μυχούς,
πόθῳ δὲ μητέρ᾽ ἠφανισμένης κόρης
μαστῆρ᾽ ἐπελθεῖν πᾶσαν ἐν κύκλῳ χθόνα,
καὶ γῆν μὲν Αἰτναίοισι Σικελίαν πάγοις
πυρὸς γέμουσαν ῥεύμασιν δυσεμβόλοις
πᾶσαν στενάξαι, πένθεσιν δὲ παρθένου
σίτων ἄμοιρον Διοτρεφὲς φθίνειν γένος,
ὅθεν θεὰς τιμῶσιν ἐς τὰ νῦν ἔτι.

6 γῆν Nauck τὴν Diod. Σικελίαν Rhodomannus -ας Diod.

F 5a Menander, *Aspis* 415–9

Δα. *ἄπιστον, ἄλογον, δεινόν.*
Σμ. οὐδὲ παύσεται;
Δα. *τί δ᾽ ἐστ᾽ ἄπιστον τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις κακῶν*
(ὁ Καρκίνος φήσ᾽); *ἐν μιᾷ γὰρ ἡμέρᾳ*
τὸν εὐτυχῆ τίθησι δυστυχῆ θεός.
εὖ πάντα ταῦτα, Σμικρίνη.

417 φης B πουφησιν F (μιᾷ del. Wilamowitz)

F 6 Harpocration *κ* 15

. . . περὶ δὲ τοῦ τῆς τραγῳδίας ποιητοῦ τοῦ Ξενοκλέους υἱοῦ Λυσίας ἐν τῷ πρὸς Μνησίμαχόν φησι· *συντίθεται δὲ τούτοις καὶ Καρκίνος ὁ ποιητὴς εἰπών·*

οὐκ οἶνος ἐξέστησε· τὰς γὰρ ἐμφύτους
ὀρθῶς παγείσας ⟨ ⟩ φρένας
οὐδεὶς ἐπαίρει καιρὸς ἐξαμαρτάνειν.

1 οὐκ οἶνος Luzac οὐ κεῖνος Harpocr. 2 ⟨καὶ πεπλασμένας⟩ Sauppe

UNIDENTIFIED PLAYS

F 5 Diodorus of Sicily (probably drawing on Timaeus's *Sicilian History*)

That the rape of Persephone occurred as we have described it, many older writers and poets have testified. The tragic poet Carcinus, who often stayed in Syracuse and observed the local people's concern for the sacrifices and festivals of Demeter and Korê, set down in his works these verses:

> They say Demeter's unnamed daughter was seized by Ploutôn through a covert plan and so descended into earth's dark recesses. Her mother, in yearning for her vanished daughter, roamed around all the earth in search of her;[5] and Sicily's land, laden on Etna's crags with unapproachable streams of fire, all groaned, and in mourning for the maiden its Zeus-nurtured people were perishing for want of grain; and so they honour the goddesses to this day.[10]

F 5a Menander, *The Shield*

> *Daos. Incredible, inexplicable, appalling —*
> *Smicrines.* Won't he give over?
> *Daos. But what is incredible amongst human ills?* (as Carcinus says). *In a single day god makes the fortunate unfortunate*. All these are well said, Smicrines.

F 6 Harpocration, *Lexicon to the Ten Attic Orators*, 'Carcinus'

. . . and concerning the tragic poet, son of Xenocles, Lysias says in his speech against Mnesimachus (fr. 235 Carey): *The poet Carcinus too concurs with this, saying:*

> Wine did not (*or* does not) derange him (*or* them); if one's inborn wits are properly fixed . . . *(two or three words missing)* . . . no occasion can induce them to go astray.

F 7 Stobaeus 3.33.1

Καρκίνου·

πολλοῖς γὰρ ἀνθρώποισι φάρμακον κακῶν
σιγή· μάλιστα δ’ ἐστὶ σώφρονος τρόπου.

F 8 Stobaeus 3.38.18

Καρκίνου·

χαίρω σ’ ὁρῶν φθονοῦντα, τοῦτ’ εἰδὼς ὅτι
ἓν δρᾷ μόνον δίκαιον ὧν ποιεῖ φθόνος·
λυπεῖ γὰρ †αὐτὸ τὸ κτῆμα† τοὺς κεκτημένους.

2 δίκαιον Porson ἴδιον Stob.

F 9? Stobaeus 4.31.60

Καρκίνου·

δειλόν ἐσθ’ ὁ πλοῦτος καὶ φιλόψυχον κακόν.

δειλόν Gesner δεινόν Stob.

F 10 Stobaeus 4.31.63

Καρκίνου·

ὁ πολλὰ πλοῦτος δυστυχέστατος κυρῶν
ὅμως μέγιστον ζῆλον ἐν βροτοῖς ἔχει.

ὁ Grotius ᾧ Stob.

F 11 Stobaeus 3.29.31, *an excerpt now lost from the chapter ‘On willingness to strive’*

F 7 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On being silent'

Carcinus:

> Many men find silence a prescription against troubles; and this belongs especially to a self-controlled temper.

F 8 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On envy'

Carcinus:

> I'm glad to see you envious, for I know well there's just one thing that envy does that is just: †*the possession itself*† is painful to those who possess it.

F 9? Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'Censure of wealth'

Carcinus:

> Wealth is a cowardly and life-loving evil.

F 10 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'Censure of wealth'

Carcinus:

> Wealth, a most wretched thing in many ways, is yet most greatly coveted by men.

F 11 *See opposite*

Notes on Carcinus II

T 1

Carcinus of Acragas is a different individual from the Athenian and otherwise unknown. Snell listed him as no. 235 in *TrGF* I^2 and suggested identifying him with Carcinus II in view of the latter's association with Sicily (**T 3**); similarly *SEHT* II.368f. (cf. Wilson 2007, 362, Csapo 2010, 40, Csapo–Wilson 2015, 334) suggesting that Carcinus II inherited Acragantine citizenship from his great-grandmother. But the Suda plainly refers to two tragedians. Carcinus II certainly spent time at Syracuse (**T 3**, **F 5**), but his family was thoroughly Athenian (cf. on Xenocles I in Vol. 1). **son of Theodectes or Xenocles:** the information is confused. Carcinus was son of Xenocles and an older contemporary of the tragedian Theodectas (p. 130 below). **160 plays . . . ⟨1⟩1 victories:** the Victors List records eleven Dionysia victories for Carcinus (assuming the restoration [Καρκί]νος is correct, see p. 60); hence Köhler's correction of the Suda's transmitted α΄ (1). Snell notes that the Suda's total should be different if it included Lenaea victories, but if α΄ was correctly written the total of Dionysia *plus* Lenaea victories would have to be twenty-one (or thirty-one!). Eleven

Dionysia victories implies a prolific production record, even if the Suda's total of 160 plays is inflated (Sophocles won 18 Dionysia victories with 120 plays in 30 productions spread over more than 60 years). **Amongst his plays . . . :** this merely names the two plays of Carcinus that happen to be named by Athenaeus (see **F 1d, F 2–3**: similarly Chaeremon **T 1**). ***Semele*, whose beginning . . . :** our text of the Suda has 'Semele or beginning', a garbled version of Athenaeus's '*Semele*, whose beginning (is) *O nights*' (**F 2**), where the whole first verse may have originally been quoted.

T 3

This is one of only three or four fragments of **Polycritus of Mende**, who wrote on Sicilian history in the late 4th/early 3rd century BC (»» N. Luraghi on *FGrH* 559 in *BNJ*). **Aeschines** is Aeschines of Sphettus, a disciple of Socrates and author of Socratic dialogues, once widely read but now surviving only in fragments. Much of our biographical information about him comes from Diogenes Laertius's gossipy and somewhat confused sketch (the description of Carcinus as a **comic poet** is his mistake). **Dionysius II** (like his father: pp. 172, 175) attracted many artists, philosophers and other writers to his court, including Plato until their estrangement in 360: »» Muccioli 1999, 170–77. Diodorus records that Carcinus 'often stayed in Syracuse' (see **F 5**), but dates and details of his visits are unknown.

T 7

From Philodemus's *On Poems* (cf. above on Dicaeogenes **T 3**). Here Philodemus is rebutting the Euphonist Pausimachus (c. 200 BC?) whose theory he summarized in *On Poems* Book 1 (Chaeremon **T 3a** is from his preceding critique of Heracleodorus, also summarized in Book 1; both theorists are known only from Philodemus's work). Euphonists held that the distinctive element of poetry and the only criterion by which it should be judged is the sound of the words themselves (»» Janko 2000, 165–89, Gutzwiller 2010, 346–54). Pausimachus further reduced 'sound' to the sounds of the 'letters' (vowels and consonants) from which words are composed, some naturally pleasing to our ears, some not (Janko 2020, 145–49 summarizes his argument). Philodemus responds that this criterion fails to differentiate bad epic poets such as Choerilus of Iasos and Anaximenes of Lampsacus (both 4th C. BC) from Homer, or bad tragic poets such as Carcinus and Cleaenetus from Euripides, and so on; the generally agreed superiority of such poets as Homer and Euripides must then be due to factors other than mere sound. Choerilus exemplifies bad poetry again in *On Poems* 3, fr. 28.22, along with a tragedian whose name is now lost, probably Carcinus or Cleaenetus (Janko 2011, 88f. n. 4). Janko identifies the paraphrases in the first half of this excerpt as F 128 and 129 in his edition of the 'fragments' of Pausimachus, Janko 2020, 588f.

F 1, F 1a, F 1b
See introductions above to Aerope, Ajax, Alope.

F 1c
Amphiaraus was coming back out of the temple: Carcinus's script seems to have required a stage movement which in practice was glaringly incongruous. This has been interpreted in a variety of plausible and implausible ways; Dettori 1997 quotes the opinions of no fewer than twenty-three scholars. Davidson 2003 refutes suggestions that Amphiaraus emerged from his tomb (ἀνῄει, 'ascended') or from a temple that was unrecognizable as such or invisible to some of the audience. The likeliest options are that he had not been seen entering the temple and/or was supposed to be somewhere else. Davidson favours the idea that he came out of the temple when he was supposed to be hiding in it to avoid joining the expedition against Thebes, but this hiding is mentioned only by Hyginus (*Fab*. 73) with no reference to a temple or sanctuary; it seems an unlikely subject for tragic treatment. Dettori argues that Carcinus's failure was one of *lexis* (his text did not explain the stage-action sufficiently), but Aristotle says plainly that it was the action itself, i.e. Amphiaraus's exit from the temple, that annoyed the audience when they saw it.

the poet, not seeing this, overlooked it: ὃ μὴ ὁρῶντα ἐλάνθανεν is lit. 'which escaped the notice of (him) not seeing'. This must refer to the poet since Aristotle's point is that the poet failed to 'see' the action when he wrote the script whereas the spectators did see it. **μὴ ὁρῶντα** means 'because he wasn't seeing it' (μή with causal participle: »» Wilkins 1993, 119 on Eur. *Hcld.* 533). **τὸν θεατήν** is a misguided attempt at clarification ('the spectator, not seeing this . . . '), retained by Tarán. Lucas deletes it but mistakenly refers μὴ ὁρῶντα to a reader of Carcinus's text. **it fell flat:** i.e. Amphiaraus's emergence from the temple; ὃ is subject of both ἐλάνθανεν and ἐξέπεσεν.

F 1d
See introduction above to Achilles.

F 1e
See above, pp. 70–72 for what this implies about Carcinus's plot. The indicatives ἥμαρτε and ἥμαρτεν ἄν introduce Aristotle's parenthetic explanations, not paraphrases of Carcinus's text. Snell included with **F 1e** a 12th-century commentator's explanation of Carcinus's context (*CAG* vol. 21.2, p. 146.30–32): πρὸς τὴν Γλαύκην, ἣν ἀνελάβετο ὁ Ἰάσων, ἔπεμψεν ἡ Μήδεια τοὺς αὑτῆς παῖδας, καὶ πτοηθεῖσα, μὴ ἀναιρεθῶσιν ὑπὸ τῶν θεραπόντων τῆς Γλαύκης, προανῃρέθησαν παρ' αὐτῆς, 'Medea sent her own sons to Glauce, whom Jason had taken as his wife, and when she became frightened that they might be killed by Glauce's servants, they were killed first by her'. This is a guess based on the plot of

Euripides' *Medea*, in which Medea sends her sons to the princess with the deadly gifts, then fears that they may be killed by her enemies in revenge and so kills them herself (Eur. *Med.* 1236ff.). It is not evidence for Carcinus's plot and does not support West's reconstruction of it (above, p. 72). A separate statement on the previous page of the commentary (quoted in part in Snell's apparatus) is similarly confused and misleading.[26] The commentator is correctly understood by Martinelli (2010, 70–73) and Lucarini (2013, 193–96).[27] He is equally uninformed about Carcinus's *Oedipus* and Sophocles' *Antigone* (see on *Oedipus*, p. 76 n. 23), Antiphon's *Meleager* (*CAG* vol. 21.2, pp. 91.32, 141.16ff.), Theodectas's *Ajax* (p. 141.20ff.), Chaeremon's *Dionysus* (p. 146.18, comment based on Euripides' *Bacchae*), and Theodectas's *Alcmeon* (**F 2**: p. 134.17ff.).

F 1e *add.*

Medea's sung lines with musical notations above are written in longer lines overlapping the spoken verses at either end and not do not match the original verse-divisions. For analysis of the music see West 2007, 8–10 = 2013a, 347–50, Hagel 2010, 323f. Editors suppose that this was an excerpt from a famous scene in Carcinus's play prepared for a concert performance. The scene might possibly have been adapted or abridged, but there is no evident sign of this. The style of the music places it in the Roman period, near the production of the papyrus (see West and Hagel above).[28] The first two voices are certainly Jason and Medea (see line 3). Creon is the likeliest choice for the vengeful third character, unless he too has died as in Euripides' play (lines 7–9 and 13 suggest otherwise: cf. West 2007, 7 = 2013a, 344f.); but we know nothing about the rest of Carcinus's plot and other characters.

2. *(save)* yourself: σῶσον (Martinelli) is apt as σῴζειν can refer to acquittal on a capital charge, as opposed to ἀπολλύναι 'condemn to death', e.g. Andocides 1.30.4, 1.56.9, Antiphon 5.46.4, 5.73.5.

3–4. Suggested supplements: '*(excellent child)***ren**' (West: for the phrasing cf. Eur. *Med.* 1337 τεκοῦσά μοι τέκνα); '*(by)* Scythia's *(greatest goddess)*' (West) or '*(by)* Scythia's *(greatest oath)*' (Burkert) or '*(by my)* Scythian *(mistress)*' (Ferrari).

---

[26] *CAG* 21.2, p. 145.30ff.: 'They accuse Medea of killing her sons; and it is clear that she did kill them from the fact that they are not to be seen but have become lost to view; for Medea made a mistake in the dispatching, i.e. the killing *(sic)* of her sons, etc.'

[27] Zouganeli 2017, 86 defends the connection of the first (p. 146.30–32) with Carcinus's plot.

[28] Taplin (2014, 152f.) suggests this might be Carcinus's original music, but apart from the stylistic indications it is unlikely that Carcinus would have composed dialogue trimeters to be sung; cf. West 2007, 8 = 2013a, 346f.

5–6. Verse-division is uncertain, hence West's '*(but I took them)* off *(to safety)*' or '*(but I sent them off)* . . . '. The latter fits well with Ferrari's reading, '*outside of this land*'.

7–10. Suggested supplements (app. crit.): 7 'Medea's impiety *(is obvious)*' (West); 8 '*(who first) killed*, destroyed etc.' (Ferrari); 9 'the Colchian woman *present here (herself)*' (Bélis/Ferrari); 10 '*(this too)* she did' (West) or '*(and when)* she had done *(this)*' (Ferrari).

11–12. Phrasing and punctuation uncertain: I follow Stephanopoulos, with West's εἶέν 'Well then' perhaps preceding. Alternatives: '*(Well then,)* why do you hesitate? You have it in your power (to take) the barbarian woman to the slaughter, Jason' (West); 'Why do you hesitate (to take) the barbarian woman to the slaughter? You have *(the right)*, Jason' (Martinelli/Ferrari: 'You have *(her)*', Battezzato). The plural **φόνους** adds impact and vividness to the demand for Medea's execution. For φόνος (sing.) denoting harsh public execution cf. Soph. *Ant.* 36 (cf. Griffith *ad loc.*), *OT* 100. **[**In other contexts the plural φόνοι is 'allusive' or 'generalizing' (Soph. *El.* 779, *OC* 962, 990, Eur. *Ion* 1026) as the plural θάνατοι sometimes is. For the varieties of poetic plurals in general see Jones 1910, Moorhouse 1982, 6f., Bers 1983, 22–46, 52–54. West (2007, 4) considered reconstructing the sentence here differently to mean e.g. 'this barbarian woman you have is prone to commit murders', but that seems unnecessary.**]**

13–16. Text very damaged, and division between 15 and 16 uncertain: see app. crit. and West 2007, 4 = 2013a, 340. The **daughter** is almost certainly Glauce (κόρη as in Eur. *Med.* 309, 324, 375 etc.). Then probably Medea accuses her accusers of prejudice against her as a 'barbarian'.

F 1f, F 1g, F 2–3, F 4

See introductions above to Oedipus, Orestes, Semele, Tyro(?)

F 5

From Diodorus's account of the myths of Demeter and Persephone in Sicily, where their association with grain production made their cult especially important.[29] The cult was promoted for political and economic purposes by the rulers of Syracuse and other Sicilian cities.[30] For Carcinus's connection with the Syracusan court see also **T 3**. **F 5** draws on a Sicilian version of the myth of the

[29] Bacchylides' *Ode* 3 invokes 'Demeter, mistress of grain-rich Sicily and violet-garlanded Korê' (3.1f.). In Pindar's *Nemean* 1 Zeus gave Sicily to Persephone and endowed it with outstanding fertility (1.13f.)

[30] Athens' interests in the cult and the Sicilian grain trade may have been a factor in the promotion and cultivation of Athenian tragedy there in the fifth century: »» Kowalzig 2008. For tragedy in Sicily generally see Vol. 1, p. xvii and *SEHT* II.277–403 (with p. 368 on the historical context of this fragment).

abduction of Persephone by the god of the underworld (Ploutôn/Hades), which led to the gift of grain-cultivation to the human race by Persephone's mother Demeter. This account as summarized by Diodorus (5.3–5) followed the same pattern as the Eleusinian myth told in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* but placed the abduction either at Enna ('the navel of Sicily', a centre for Persephone's cult) or near Syracuse (see below on lines 1–3) and made the people of Sicily the first recipients of Demeter's gift, ahead of Eleusis (the primacy of Eleusis in spreading the knowledge of grain cultivation is however recognized in Diodorus's summary). **F 5** is the earliest explicit statement of the Sicilian account, although it seems to underlie some previous sources.[31]

At several points (see notes below) Carcinus's narrative borrows phrasing from the second stasimon of Euripides' *Helen* (*Hel.* 1301–68), a version of the abduction story in which the bereaved goddess is identified with the Phrygian Mountain Mother (Cybele: see on Diogenes **F 1** in Vol. 1). In her search the Mother roams the earth on a chariot drawn by wild animals, then retreats to the snowy summit of Mt. Ida, sends famine on the human race, and is finally pacified with ecstatic music brought to her at Zeus's command by the Graces, Muses and Aphrodite.

Play and dramatic context are unidentifiable. Xanthakis-Karamanos's suggestion (1980, 89) that the fragment comes from a prologue speech is doubted by Stephanopoulos 1988b, 6f. (cf. Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 45f.).

1–3. Demeter's unnamed girl: Persephone's name is 'unspoken' because of her association with the dead, and Korê ('Daughter') a convenient euphemism. She is ἄρρητος κούρα in Eur. *Hel.* 1307 and *Alexander* F 63. **a covert plan:** the god emerged on his chariot from the bowels of the earth as Persephone played with friends amongst preternaturally beautiful flowers (*Hom. Hymn.* 2.2–18, Diodorus 5.3.1–3), cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1322 θυγατρὸς ἁρπαγὰς δολίους, 'her daughter's deceitful seizure'. **descended into earth's dark recesses:** Diodorus 5.3.2 places the abduction and descent at Enna, but in 5.4.2 at the Cyanê spring near Syracuse, describing an annual commemorative festival there (*Korês katagôgê*, The Maiden's Descent). The adj. μελαμφαής (lit. 'dark-lit') is found in classical Greek only here and at Eur. *Hel.* 519.

4–5. Her mother, in yearning etc.: similar phrasing in Eur. *Hel.* 1306f. πόθῳ τᾶς ἀποιχομένας κούρας, 'in yearning for her departed daughter'; *Hom. Hymn* 2.201 = 304 πόθῳ . . . βαθυζώνοιο θυγατρός, 'in yearning for her deep-girt daughter'. **roamed around all the earth:** an essential part of the myth, bringing the goddess to places that will become important cult centres. In the *Homeric Hymn* she roams over the earth for 9 days brandishing torches, fasting and unwashed (47ff.), and after finding the truth about her daughter from Helios roams again disguised as an old woman until she reaches Eleusis (90ff.); her

[31] See Richardson 1974, 75 with n. 1 (myth variants in general, 74–86)

torch-lit search was re-enacted annually in the Mysteries there. See also Eur. *Hel.* 1301ff. (above), Diodorus 5.4.3–5.

6–8. and Sicily's land etc.: the lava streams of Mt. Etna characterize Sicily as a whole, but there may be an allusion to Demeter's lighting her torches from them (Diodorus 5.4.3). The rape itself was sometimes located near Etna (Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 1.14 = 1.20 Drachmann). **on Etna's crags, Αἰτναίοισι . . . πάγοις:** cf. Eur. *Cyc.* 95 Αἰτναῖον πάγον.

8–9. in grief for the maiden: cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1337 πένθει παιδὸς ἀλάστῳ, 'in ceaseless grief for her child'. There as in *Hom.Hymn* 2.302–12 Demeter's grief causes her to afflict the human race with famine. Here the phrasing suggests that the people share her grief. Myths of famine caused by an angry god's withdrawal or disappearance were widespread in the ancient Near East: »» Richardson 1974, 258–60. **its Zeus-nurtured people:** cf. Pindar, *Nem.* 1.13 (p. 87 n. 29 above).

10. and so they honour etc.: the story skips from the crisis to the final outcome. Mythical narratives are often abbreviated in this way in Greek poetry, especially in the odes of Pindar and Euripides.

F 5a

From Act 3 of Menander's *Aspis ('The Shield')*. In lines 407–32 the educated slave Daos assures the avaricious Smicrines that the latter's brother has died, and elaborates the pretence with a series of gnomic quotations from tragedy. Editors differ over the extent of the quotation from Carcinus, either all of 415a and 416–8 (Snell, cf. Xanthakis–Karamanos 1980, 131), or 416 alone with the rest assigned to unidentified tragedies (Austin 1970, Arnott 1979), or possibly all of 416–8 but not 415a. Gomme–Sandbach (1973, 97) leave the question open. The second option seems likeliest since the point of the scene is that Daos spouts a variety of different *gnômai* ('All these are well said', 419). The insecurity of human fortunes and their subjection to divine will are of course very common tragic themes, e.g. Eur. *HF* 509–12, F 420, 536, 549, 618, Chaeremon **F 19**, Theodectas **F 16**, Sosiphanes **F 3**; for others emphasizing 'a single day' see e.g. Eur. *Hec.* 282–85, *Pho.* 1689, Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 132.

[A brief anthology found in the Thessaloniki codex of Photius's *Lexicon* includes Μενάνδρου κωμῳδία· σκιὰ τὰ θνητῶν· ἐν μιᾷ γὰρ ἡμέρᾳ | τὸν εὐτυχῆ τίθησι δυστυχῆ θεός ('A comedy of Menander: 'Mortal life is a mirage; in a single day etc.''). This could be the couplet from which Daos's quotation in lines 417–18 came, and the quotation would then be definitely unconnected with line 416; but the first phrase (σκιὰ τὰ θνητῶν) may not have belonged with the rest originally: »» Gomme–Sandbach 1973, 97.**]**

F 6

Nothing more is known of Lysias's speech or Carcinus's context. The opening phrase adapts Euripides' *Auge* F 272b, which was probably part of Heracles'

apology for raping Auge: 'As it is, wine deranged me (νῦν δ' οἶνος ἐξέστησέ μ'); I admit I wronged you etc.' *Auge* was one of Euripides' latest plays; Carcinus's play will have been produced 25–30 years later, before Lysias's death around 380. **Wine did not (*or* does not) derange him (*or* them): ἐξέστησε** probably refers to the past as in the Euripidean model, but it could be a gnomic aorist matching with the present-tense verb in line 3; the whole quotation would then have referred to the kind of man who does not behave wildly when drunk, perhaps used by Lysias in arguing that drunkenness was no excuse for Mnesimachus's misbehaviour. **[**Sauppe's conjecture would give 'fixed *⟨and moulded⟩*', i.e. educated, cf. LSJ 'πλάσσω' II.**]**

F 7

Keeping quiet will keep you out of trouble: a reminiscence of Aesch. *Ag.* 548, πάλαι τὸ σιγᾶν φάρμακον βλάβης ἔχω, 'I have long found silence a prescription against harm'; the φάρμακον is a prophylactic, not a 'cure'. Cf. Phaedra's strategy of silence in Eur. *Hipp.* 392–97.

F 8

A variation on a well-worn condemnation of *phthonos*, e.g. Isocrates 9.6, 'envy, whose only merit is that it is the greatest evil for those who own it', Plato, *Laws* 870c.5–7, 'envious feelings, troublesome partners above all for the very one who possesses the envy (αὐτῷ τῷ κεκτημένῳ τὸν φθόνον)', and others collected by Stephanopoulos 1988b, 8–10. Verse 3 makes sense but is unmetrical. **[**One might expect αὐτοὺς . . . τοὺς κεκτημένους ('the very people who possess it', cf. Plato above, and suppose τὸ κτῆμα to be a gloss, but that leaves a gap of two syllables which has not been convincingly filled. Stephanopoulos discusses and rejects many conjectures.**]**

F 9?

Rich people are soft and unwilling to face dangers and death: cf. Mastronarde on Eur. *Pho.* 597 comparing Eur. F 54, F 235 and others. The verse is either a metrically corrupt iambic trimeter or a trochaic tetrameter without its first two syllables. It almost reproduces *Pho.* 597, εἰσορῶ· δειλόν δ' ὁ πλοῦτος καὶ φιλόψυχον κακόν ('I see you; but wealth is cowardly etc.'). Carcinus might have copied this, but more probably this is Euripides' verse adapted and a different verse of Carcinus has been lost from Stobaeus's text (see Hense's apparatus; *Pho.* 597 is repeated in the same chapter, 4.31.75, but so are several other Euripidean excerpts, e.g. *Erechtheus* F 362.14–17 = Stobaeus 4.31. 25 and 36.)

F 10

most wretched . . . in many ways: being insecure, encouraging vice, bringing conflicts and anxieties etc. The theme is fully illustrated in Stobaeus's chapter.

CHAEREMON
(*TrGF* 71)

Texts etc. TrGF 1^2.215–27 with *addenda* 1^2.353f., 5.1112; *MusTr* 154–67, 289f.

Discussions. Welcker 1841, 1082–95; Bartsch 1843; Hoffmann 1951, 180–83; Snell 1971, 158–69; Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 71–84, 90–95 and *passim*; Mueller-Goldingen 2005, 88–96; Collard 2007, 31–55 (revised from 1970); Wright 2016a, 122–30; Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 47–54. See also below on *Achilles*.

Satyr-play? (Centaur, F 9a–11, F 14b?). *GrSat* 580–90; Cipolla 2003, 276, 290–93, 307–11. See also O'Sullivan–Collard 2013, 498–501 (on P. Köln 11.431) and 508.

*Almost nothing is known of Chaeremon's life and career. There is no documentary evidence and the Suda's brief entry (**T 1**) contributes nothing, but his first victories at city festivals probably came before about 380.*[1] *There are two brief allusions in fragments of comic poets active in the second quarter of the fourth century (Eubulus fr. 128 = Chaeremon T 2 with **F 17**; Ephippus fr. 9* PCG *= Chaeremon T 4). Aristotle mentions him twice in the* Rhetoric *(**T 3**, **F 4**) and twice in the* Poetics *(F 9a on the polymetric* Centaur*), apparently as a poet of the recent past. His career, then, can be placed roughly within the period 385–350. Of the forty text-fragments, twenty-one are due to Stobaeus and thirteen to Athenaeus, including eight in a discussion of female and floral beauty (**F 1**, **5–9**, 10, **12–14**: see **F 1** n.) and three in a discussion of garlands (**F 6**, 7, 11). The other six are mostly proverbs, gnomic statements and rhetorical examples. Seven of the nine known titles come from the two passages of Athenaeus just mentioned.*

[1] The Victors Lists inscription gives first Dionysia victories for two poets other than Chaeremon (probably including Carcinus II) before Astydamas II's first victory in 372 and four more after it (including Theodectas and Aphareus: *IG* II^2 2325.42–48, Millis–Olson p. 145 = *TrGF* DID A 3a.42–48), and the Fasti inscription shows that the victor in 375 was Sophocles II (*IG* II^2 2318.1153, Millis–Olson p. 42 = *TrGF* DID A 1.244). The Victors Lists also name five poets other than Chaeremon before Astydamas II's first Lenaea victory (which was probably before 372) and one more after it (*IG* II^2 2325.235–41, Millis–Olson p. 205 = *TrGF* DID A 3b.37–42).

*Chaeremon was nevertheless a noted tragedian. Some of his plays were known at least through the Hellenistic period, and possibly to later enthusiasts such as Athenaeus (though the latter's quotations seem to have come from anthologies). Aristotle mentions only four other tragedians of this era (Antiphon, Astydamas, Carcinus, Theodectas) and chose Chaeremon to exemplify a distinct compositional style (**T 3**). A character in Menander quotes him alongside Euripides as 'no ordinary poet' (**F 42**). His* Achilles *is probably reflected in a fine Apulian vase-painting from around 340 and was certainly revived about a hundred years later (below, pp. 96f.). Two fragments from Philodemus,* On Poems *(**T 3a**) suggest that his work was a topic for philosophical discussion in the first century BC, even if he was considered inferior to a great dramatist such as Euripides.*

The fragments themselves tell us nothing about the content of Chaeremon's plays, which except for Achilles *can only be guessed from their titles, or about their dramatic qualities. Instead they exemplify some characteristic features of his poetic style. The precision of expression noted by Aristotle can be seen in the meticulously phrased, epithet-laden descriptions quoted by Athenaeus,*[2] *which artfully combine inherited and original elements.*[3] *There are many enigmatic metaphors (**F 5**, **6**, **9–13**, cf. **17**, **41**) and recondite or invented compound epithets (**F 1** κηρόχρωτες, **F 7** τριέλικας, **F 8** ὀξυφεγγῆ, **F 10** ἄλογχον, **F 14** σεληνόφως, καλλίχειρας, μελανόφυλλα, ἠλιῶδες, **F 39** ῥιζοφοιτητούς). Chaeremon's descriptions of the natural world and the human figure have a distinctly pictorial quality, especially in **F 1** and **F 14** with their evocations of the design and colouring of visual artworks.*[4]

The gnomic fragments are similarly refined, often reformulating old truisms in new and elegant ways. The frequency of Chaeremon's gnômai *in Stobaeus's anthology and Philodemus's comments on the 'wholesomeness' of his plays suggest that they may have had the same kind of*

---

[2] Two-thirds of the thirty-seven complete verses quoted by Athenaeus are three- or four-word trimeters (three and twenty-one respectively); cf. below, p. 260 on Moschion **F 6**.

[3] See especially Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 73–79 (**F 14**), 81–84 (**F 1**) and more generally Collard 2007, 38–40.

[4] Piatkowski 1981 discusses these fragments as responding to the naturalistic depiction of the human figure in Greek art of the late fifth and early fourth centuries.

moralizing tone that we find later in Menander's comedies. The gnômai *were probably deployed liberally for rhetorical effect, but some seem to have a distinctly philosophical or didactic tone.*[5]

*Scholars in the nineteenth century and some in the twentieth were inclined to see Chaeremon as primarily or even exclusively a composer of satyr-plays. This view was encouraged by the Suda's mistaken labelling of him as κωμικός (**T 1** with note) and by the content and some of the titles of the plays quoted by Athenaeus, but this is weak evidence and the indications that he was a serious tragedian are much stronger (»» Morelli 2003, 14–16 with mention of earlier views). Athenaeus refers to him as such several times, as does the Latin grammarian who describes the 'Chaeremonian verse' in **F 43**; these labels presumably echo Hellenistic scholarship.* Achilles*, once mooted as a satyr-play, is now firmly classified as a tragedy. Aristotle, Menander and Philodemus all treat Chaeremon as a tragedian (above, p. 92). He probably composed some satyr-plays for productions at the City Dionysia, but even that is not certain.*[6] *Four of his titles might suggest satyr-plays, but* Dionysus *is ruled out if **F 4** is assigned to that play. On* Io *and* Minyans *(both cited uniquely by Athenaeus) see the introductions below. The* Centaur*, which Aristotle called a 'mixed* rhapsoidia *from all the metres'*[7] *and Athenaeus a 'polymetric drama' (13.608e), is anomalous on any account but is now usually regarded as a satyr-play.*[8]

---

[5] See Mueller-Goldingen 2005, 89–96 noting that this is hard to verify without dramatic contexts; also Wright 2016a, 123–25 on Chaeremon's 'quotability', with Wright 2016b, 613–16 on the tendency of Greek playwrights to incorporate quotable words of wisdom in their works.

[6] The Didascaliae inscription indicates that at some point before 341 the City Dionysia's three-tragedies-plus-satyr-play pattern had been replaced with a single satyr-play before the tragedies (*IG* II^2 2320.1ff, Millis–Olson p. 65 = *TrGF* DID 2a.1ff.), but how long before is not known, nor how satyr-play poets were appointed under the new system. Chaeremon may have needed to produce a satyr-play only rarely.

[7] *Poetics* 1447b22 (cf. 1460a2). 'All the metres' must mean those metres appropriate for epic (and perhaps other) recitation in addition to dramatic dialogue.

[8] See the references in the bibliography above and in Morelli 2003, 14 n. 5. Morelli himself argues vigorously for identifying the *Centaur* as an innovative tragedy (cf. Steffen 1979, 79). It is likely to have been a satyr-play if the acrostic fragment F 14b (P. Hibeh 2.224, col. ii.1–8) is rightly assigned to it (cf. Snell *ad loc.* and 1971, 166–68); its hexameter verses imitate the archaic *Precepts of*

T 1 Suda χ 170

Χαιρήμων, κωμικός. τῶν δραμάτων αὐτοῦ ἐστι ταῦτα· Τραυματίας, ὡς Ἀθήναιός φησιν, καὶ Οἰνεὺς καὶ Ἀλφεσίβοια καὶ Κένταυρος καὶ Διόνυσος καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ Θυέστης καὶ Μινύαι.

T 2 *See above, p. 91.*

T 3 Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1413b3–21

δεῖ δὲ μὴ λεληθέναι ὅτι ἄλλη ἑκάστῳ γένει ἁρμόττει λέξις. οὐ γὰρ ἡ αὐτὴ γραφικὴ καὶ ἀγωνιστική . . . ἔστι δὲ λέξις γραφικὴ μὲν ἡ ἀκριβεστάτη, ἀγωνιστικὴ δὲ ἡ ὑποκριτικωτάτη· ταύτης δὲ δύο εἴδη, ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἠθικὴ ἡ δὲ παθητική.[10] διὸ καὶ οἱ ὑποκριταὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν δραμάτων διώκουσι, καὶ οἱ ποιηταὶ τοὺς τοιούτους· βαστάζονται δὲ οἱ ἀναγνωστικοί, οἷον Χαιρήμων (ἀκριβὴς γὰρ ὥσπερ λογογράφος) καὶ Λικύμνιος τῶν διθυραμβοποιῶν. καὶ παραβαλλόμενοι ⟨οἱ λόγοι⟩ οἱ μὲν τῶν γραφικῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι στενοὶ φαίνονται,[15] οἱ δὲ τῶν ῥητόρων {ἢ τῶν λεχθέντων} ἰδιωτικοὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσίν. αἴτιον δ’ ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἀγῶνι ἁρμόττει τὰ ὑποκριτικά· διὸ καὶ ἀφῃρημένης τῆς ὑποκρίσεως οὐ ποιοῦντα τὸ αὐτῶν ἔργον φαίνεται εὐήθη, οἷον τά τε ἀσύνδετα καὶ τὸ πολλάκις τὸ αὐτὸ εἰπεῖν ἐν τῇ γραφικῇ ὀρθῶς ἀποδοκιμάζεται,[20] ἐν δὲ ἀγωνιστικῇ οὔ, καὶ οἱ ῥήτορες χρῶνται· ἔστι γὰρ ὑποκριτικά.

14 ⟨οἱ λόγοι⟩ Kassel 16 ἢ τῶν λεχθέντων mss. A*Γ* (εὖ λεχθέντων ms. F, εὖ μὲν λεχθέντες anon. comm., ἀλεχθέντων other mss.) del. Kassel (*olim* Spengel) 17 ἁρμόττει τὰ ὑποκριτικά· διὸ καὶ Thurot, Ross ἁρμόττει· διὸ καὶ τὰ ὑποκριτικά mss. 21 ὑποκριτικά mss. ATu -ή ms. La -όν anon. comm.

T 3a Philodemus, *On Poems* 2, cols 7.1–14 and 33.11–24 ed. Janko (2020)

(col. 7) . . . ὧν ποι[εῖ] μὲν ἴσως ἕνεκα [ἐσ]τὶν ἃ τ̣ῶν οὐ πονη[ρῶν], ἔπ̣[ει]τα ἐν ἄθλιον, ὡς καὶ Χαιρήμονα καὶ τοὺς ὁμοίους. οὐ γὰρ ἐν νοήματι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ποιᾷ̣ συν[θέ]σει φράζωμεν ὡς τ̣ὰγα[θ]ὸν νομίζε[ι] τῶν ποη[μάτων]. ὅθεν ἀδολεσχία [πεφλυάρη]ται μακρὰ τὰς [Χαιρήμο]νος ἀπόητους ἀ[ποπλανηθ]έ̣ντι περὶ χρησ[τῶν δ]ιανοημάτων [συνθέσεις γεγράφθαι . . .

Cheiron ([Hesiod] frs 283–285 M–W = 218–220 Most) and may have been delivered by the centaur Cheiron to a pupil such as Achilles and a chorus of satyrs (this would help to account for the play’s being ‘polymetric’; Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 50f. question its satyric character, however). I doubt the acrostic was composed as a *sphragis* for his play by Chaeremon himself, as has been widely assumed (recently Luz 2010, 7–15, Zouganeli 2013, 3–7, Pacelli 2016, 39f., Liapis–Stephanopoulos *ibid.*). Schubert (2013) argues that it was compiled from individual verses of Chaeremon, and (less plausibly) that the compiler may have drawn on more than one play.

T 1 Suda

Chaeremon, comic poet. These are some of his dramas: *The Wounded Man*, as Athenaeus says, and *Oeneus, Alphesiboea, Centaur, Dionysus, Odysseus, Thyestes,* and *Minyans.*

T 2 *See above, p. 91.*

T 3 Aristotle, *Rhetoric*

One should keep in mind that a different style suits each kind (i.e. of rhetoric). For written style is not the same as agonistic style (i.e. the style of public debate) . . . . Written style is the most precise, while agonistic style is the most dramatic; and of this there are two aspects, the one conveying character, the other emotion.[10] Hence actors too seek out these kinds of dramas (i.e. those in agonistic style), and poets these kinds of actors (i.e. those adept in that style), whereas readerly poets are kept in hand (i.e. for study and reference), for example Chaeremon, who is precise in the manner of a speechwriter, and amongst dithyrambists Licymnius. And when compared the speeches of those employing written style seem meagre in public debates,[15] while those of the orators seem inept in a reader's hands. This is because the dramatic features are suitable in performance, and so when the element of acting is removed they do not fulfil their own function and seem artless; for example, asyndeta and frequent repetitions are rightly disapproved in written style[20] but not in agonistic style, and orators use them, as they are dramatic.

T 3a Philodemus, *On Poems,* Book 2

(col. 7) . . . for which reasons, perhaps, he (i.e. a bad poet) composes *some (*sc. *verses)* that are not bad and then one wretched one, as do Chaeremon and those like him. For let us point out that he (i.e. Heracleodorus) considers the goodness of *poems* to be not only in thought but also in composition of a certain kind. And so he has rambled on at length stating *erratically* that *(Chaeremon's)* unpolished *(compositions are written)* about wholesome thought-content *(but are nevertheless bad)* . . .

(col. 33) . . . καὶ ἔτι μ[ᾶλλον ἐν ἐκεί]νωι (*sc.* λέγοιτ' ἂν σφάλλειν) λέγων [τῶι κἂν ἦι τὰ] νοούμενα π̣[ονηρά, μη]δὲ̣ πονηρὸν φα[νήσεσθαι] τὸ πόημ[α], καὶ μηδ[ένα] βλάψειν τ̣ὸ φαῦλον, ὡ[ς] οὐδ' Εὐριπ̣ίδην, δια[νό]ημα, μηδ' ὠφελήσ[ειν] τὸ χρηστόν, ὡς οὐδὲ [Χαι]ρήμονα· π̣αρέλκεται γ[ὰρ] τὸ χρηστὸν ἢ φαῦλο̣[ν] εἶναι ⟨τὸ⟩ διανόημα τ[ὸ] ἀ[πό]ητον εἰς ποητικὴν [γε ἀ]ρετήν.

ΑΛΦΕΣΙΒΟΙΑ

For the probable subject of this play see Vol. 1, p. 108 with n. 3 on Achaeus's Alphesiboea.

F 1 Athenaeus 13.608d

ἐπικατάφορος δὲ ὢν ὁ ποιητὴς οὗτος ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνθη καὶ ἐν Ἀλφεσιβοίᾳ φησίν·

καὶ σώματος μὲν †ὄψεις κατειργάζετο†
στίλβοντα λευκῷ †χρώματι διαπρεπῆ†,
αἰδὼς δ' ἐπερρύθμιζεν ἠπιώτατον
ἐρύθημα λαμπρῷ προστιθεῖσα χρώματι·
κόμαι δὲ κηρόχρωτες ὡς ἀγάλματος
αὐτοῖσι βοστρύχοισιν ἐκπεπλασμένου
ξουθοῖσιν ἀνέμοις ἐνετρύφων φορούμεναι.

5 κηροχρῶτες Ath. κηρόχρωτος Wilamowitz 6 ἐκπεπλασμένου Meineke -μένοι Ath. 7 φορούμεναι Hermann -οι Ath.

ΑΧΙΛΛΕΥΣ

Robert 1919, 278–86; *LIMC* I, 'Achilleus' nos 794–96; *LIMC* VIII (Suppl.), 'Thersites'; Xanthakis-Karamanos 1982–83; 2017, 214–22; Padgett et al. 1993, 99–105; Gantz 1993, 621f.; Morelli 2001 (with reviews by Green 2002, Palmisciano 2004, Cropp 2005); Taplin 2007, 232–34 and 2014, 154f.; Fantuzzi 2012, 267–86; Vahtikari 2014, 125–27.

Three titles presumably refer to a single play of Chaeremon: Achilles *in an inscription from Tegea listing an actor's performance at Dodona in the mid-3rd century BC (*TrGF *T 5 = F 1a),* Achilles Thersitoktonos *in Stobaeus (**F 2**), and* Thersites *in the Suda (**F 3**). The first would have*

(col. 33) . . . and still more (*sc.* could he be said to slip up) in his statement on the former point, *(that even if the)* thoughts are bad the poem will *not appear* bad *as well*, and that inferior thought-content will not harm any poet, as neither does it harm Euripides, nor will wholesome content benefit him, as neither does it benefit *(Chae)*remon, *as* the unpolished thought-content's being wholesome or inferior is dragged inappropriately into (the assessment of) poetic excellence.

ALPHESIBOEA

F 1 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* (following **F 14**)

This poet, being captivated by flowers, says again in *Alphesiboea*:

Her body's †*appearances was effected*† gleaming †*conspicuous*† with a pale †*complexion*†, while modesty tempered it, adding a most gentle blush to its radiant complexion; and her wax-blonde hair, as of a statue finely modelled with locks and all, played as it was stirred by rustling breezes.

ACHILLES

been its official title. It is not in the Suda's brief list of Chaeremon's plays since that includes only those that Athenaeus happens to mention (see ***T 1*** *n.). It was however celebrated enough to be performed on the festival circuit a hundred years or so after its first performance (the Tegea inscription) and probably to be the subject of a fine Apulian vase-painting much closer to its own time (see below). The text fragments* ***F 2–3*** *tell us nothing about the plot.*

Achilles' killing of Thersites was part of a major episode in the epic Aethiopis *which seems to have followed immediately on the funeral of*

Hector at the end of the Iliad.[9] *In Proclus's summary (tr. West,* GEF *p. 111)*:[10]

> The Amazon Penthesilea arrives to fight with the Trojans . . . She dominates the battlefield, but Achilles kills her and the Trojans bury her. And Achilles kills Thersites after being abused by him and insulted over his alleged love for Penthesilea. This results in a dispute among the Achaeans about the killing of Thersites. Achilles then sails to Lesbos, and after sacrificing to Apollo, Artemis, and Leto he is purified from the killing by Odysseus.

The Aethiopis*'s account may have been followed fairly closely in Quintus of Smyrna's epic* Posthomerica *(1.625–830, 4th C. AD). After killing Penthesilea, Achilles removes her helmet and is struck by her beauty, and while the Achaeans admire her he grieves for her death and imagines how she might have become his wife. Thersites abuses him for this unmanly reaction, and Achilles in anger kills him with a single blow of his fist. This is generally approved but antagonizes Thersites' kinsman Diomedes, and the Achaean leaders have to intervene to avert violence between the two. The Amazon's corpse is then returned to Priam for honourable burial while Thersites is buried dishonourably apart from the other Achaean dead. One detail that Quintus tactfully omits is that Achilles held Penthesilea in his arms as she expired. This is seen in some 6th–4th century vase-paintings and was depicted in Panainos's painting on a panel beneath the throne of Zeus at Olympia (Pausanias 5.11.6). It may have originated in the* Aethiopis*, thus adding substance to Thersites' taunts; but the epic poem must still have treated Achilles' emotion as essentially noble and demeaned by Thersites' accusation.*

Accounts from the Hellenistic and later periods add some lurid elaborations:[11] *Thersites disfigured the dead Amazon by putting out her eye(s) with a spear or stake; Achilles actively lusted for her or even had intercourse with her corpse; Diomedes reacted to Thersites' death by dragging the Amazon's corpse and throwing it into the river Scamander. The differences between the epic and these later traditions are evident in*

---

[9] Cf. *Aethiopis* F 1 *GEF* with West 2013b, 136–43 for a reconstruction of the Penthesilea and Thersites episodes in the *Aethiopis*. Burgess (2001, 140f.) suggests that F 1 may not have been the beginning of the original *Aethiopis*.

[10] This is Chaeremon F *1b in *TrGF* but there is no direct connection between the epic summary and Chaeremon's plot.

[11] The sources are fully set out and discussed by Morelli (2001) and helpfully surveyed by Fantuzzi 2012, 267–79.

Tzetzes' commentary on Lycophron's Alexandra *999–1001. Lycophron's enigmatic allusion to the episode includes the earliest mention of Thersites putting out Penthesilea's eye, but Tzetzes in his commentary attributes this detail and Achilles'* erôs *to 'ignorant people' (οἱ μὴ εἰδότες), and asserts that Achilles simply admired Penthesilea's heroism and beauty, wept over her, and called on the Achaeans to allow her burial (i.e. to return her body to the Trojans as in the* Aethiopis *and Quintus).*[12]

The Apulian vase, from around 340 BC, is our only likely evidence for Chaeremon's treatment of the story (see the cover of this book). All the figures are named. At the centre, Achilles (naked except for his sword-belt) sits with a dejected-looking Phoenix on an elaborate couch in a portico representing his tent. He looks away from Phoenix (as if rejecting his advice as in Iliad *9) and towards a group approaching from the right: Diomedes drawing his sword, Menelaus restraining him, and a following warrior named Aitolos ('Aetolian', i.e. one of Thersites' men). From the left Agamemnon approaches hastily, also followed by a warrior identified undistinctively as Phorbas. On a lower level the corpse and severed head of Thersites lie surrounded by a tripod and various vessels scattered on the ground, and watched over by a crouching and armed warrior named Automedon (the name of Achilles' charioteer in the* Iliad*), while on the right a servant (ΔΜΩΣ), a poetic term) recoils from the scene. Above, to the left and right of the roof of the portico, are two pairs of divine figures: a winged Erinys named* Poinâ, *('Vengeance') conversing with Pan, and Athena conversing with Hermes.*

The vase obviously focuses on the conflict following the killing of Thersites,[13] *but the scattering of vessels around his corpse and his civilian clothing seem to imply that Achilles has killed him during a post-battle religious ceremony rather than on the battlefield in the heat of the moment, and the crouching Automedon appears to be guarding the corpse on Achilles' behalf, perhaps denying it burial despite Phoenix's persuasion (this would echo Achilles' abuse of Hector's corpse in the* Iliad*). The crisis, then, seems to involve more than Diomedes' wish to avenge his kinsman, and the gods on the upper level may be understood*

[12] Similarly the brief comment of Eustathius on *Iliad* 2.220 included in *TrGF* F *1b).

[13] Xanthaki-Karamanou 2017 suggests that in Chaeremon's play this will have taken the form of an agôn, with Agamemnon arbitrating between Achilles and Diomedes.

accordingly, Pan and Poinâ suggesting the turmoil and vengefulness implicit in the situation, Athena and Hermes a divinely authorized settlement that would include the burial of Thersites and Achilles' absolution from blood-guilt, perhaps on Lesbos as in the Aethiopis.[14]

This in essence was the interpretation of Carl Robert, who also proposed the identification of the vase-scene with Chaeremon's play. His view has been widely accepted, though with some hesitations.[15] *Taplin, for example, accepts that the vase includes features often associated with dramatic scenes on 4th-century vases (the portico suggesting a theatrical* skênê*, Agamemnon's royal costume and sceptre, the Erinys, the labelling of generic characters) but sees difficulty in the profusion of named figures and the non-Attic spellings of some of the names (Poinâ, Athânâ, Hermâs, Thersitâs: South Italian vases related to Attic drama usually use the Attic spellings). These are not decisive objections, and Robert's identification seems valid if we see the vase as evoking a well-known tragic plot through its key elements rather than replicating a particular scene or scenes. The same is true, for example, of the Darius*

F 2 Stobaeus 1.6.7 (and Menander, *Aspis* 411 without attribution; some or all quoted or paraphrased as proverbial in Plato, *Laws* 709b, Demosthenes 2.22, Plutarch, *Moralia* 97c, Libanius *Or.* 25.11, etc.: see note on **F 2** below)

Χαιρήμονος ἐξ Ἀχιλλέως Θερσιτοκτόνου·

τύχη τὰ θνητῶν πράγματ', οὐκ εὐβουλία.

[14] Morelli (2001, 149–52) argues persuasively that the palm-branch decorated with a ribbon that Hermes carries indicates a successful outcome to the quest for absolution on which he will escort Achilles.

[15] See especially Green 2002, and Taplin 2007, 234 and 2014, 154f. Xanthakis-Karamanos 1982–83 followed Robert closely.

Painter's vase representing Euripides' Hypsipyle.[16] *As for the source, Chaeremon's was certainly the best-known tragedy on this subject and may well have been the only one.*[17]

Morelli (2001) goes considerably further than Robert, arguing that a vase-scene in which all the figures are named must reflect the play's characters and action with some precision. In his reconstruction, all of the human figures except Automedon have speaking parts, and Aitolos represents a chorus of Aetolians supporting Thersites and Diomedes; the play's action starts from the dispute over the treatment of the dying Amazon and includes reports of the abuse of her body by Thersites and Diomedes, and of the killing of Thersites at a sacrifice, followed by the dispute over his burial and its resolution. Ingenious as this is, it seems improbably action-packed and relies heavily on attributing later myth-variants to Chaeremon. It seems at least as likely that his play was limited to the killing of Thersites and its aftermath. It may even have begun after the killing and consisted largely of rhetorical debates on the lines of such plays as Aeschylus's Ransoming of Hector *or Sophocles'* Ajax *and* Antigone*, all of which are concerned with disputed burials.*

F 2 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On fortune'

Chaeremon, from *Achilles Slayer of Thersites*:

Mortals' affairs are fortune, not forethought.

---

[16] See Taplin 2007, no. 79. The composition there is very similar to our vase. In a central portico Hypsipyle pleads with Eurydice after accidentally causing her son's death, and Amphiaraus intervenes on her behalf (the play's rhetorical high-light). Below, the boy is elaborately laid out for burial. Outside the portico are Hypsipyle's sons (who will be reunited with her at the end of the play) and also Capaneus and Parthenopaeus (who are contextually relevant as two of the Seven against Thebes but not dramatically active). Above are Dionysus (Hypsipyle's grandfather who will appear as *deus ex machina*) and Zeus and Nemea (again contextually relevant as the local deities but not dramatically active).

[17] For Aristarchus's *Achilles* see Vol. 1, pp. 60f. and for Carcinus's *Achilles* above, pp. 68f. The title is also known for Iophon (**T 1** in Vol. 1), Astydamas II (T 5, p. 30 above), Euaretus (*TrGF* 85 T 1) and one of Diogenes of Sinope's 'tragedies' (**T 1**, p. 207 below).

F 3 Suda ω 237 (and without attribution in Suda *υ* 161 and Photius *υ* 79; for other sources see the note on **F 3** below)

ὑπάρχων· προκατάρχων.

ὡς οὐχ ὑπάρχων, ἀλλὰ τιμωρούμενος,

παροιμία. ὁ στίχος δέ ἐστι Χαιρήμονος ἐκ Θερσίτου.

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ

A plot like those of Aeschylus's Pentheus or Bacchae, *Euripides'* Bacchae *and other such plays is usually inferred from* ***F 4*** *(although that is assigned to* Dionysus *only because it mentions Pentheus).* ***F 15*** *may also be from this play: see note there.*

F 4 Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1400b24

ἄλλος (*sc.* τόπος) ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος, οἷον ὡς . . . , καὶ ὡς Χαιρήμων,

Πενθεὺς ἐσομένης συμφορᾶς ἐπώνυμος.

F 5 Athenaeus 13.608e

ἐν δὲ Διονύσῳ·

χορῶν ἐραστὴς κισσός, ἐνιαυτοῦ δὲ παῖς.

F 6 Athenaeus 15.676f

καὶ ἐν τῷ Διονύσῳ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ἔφη ποιητής·

στεφάνους τεμόντες ἀγγέλους εὐφημίας.

F 7 Athenaeus 15.679f

καλοῦνται δέ τινες καὶ ἑλικτοὶ στέφανοι, ὥσπερ παρὰ Ἀλεξανδρεῦσι μέχρι καὶ νῦν. μνημονεύει δ' αὐτῶν Χαιρήμων ὁ τραγῳδοποιὸς ἐν Διονύσῳ διὰ τούτων·

κισσῷ τε ναρκίσσῳ τε τριέλικας κύκλῳ
στεφάνων ἑλικτῶν.

1 κύκλους Nauck

ΘΥΕΣΤΗΣ

For possible subjects see on Agathon's Thyestes in Vol. 1.

F 8 Athenaeus 13.608f

καὶ ἐν Θυέστῃ·

ῥόδ' ὀξυφεγγῆ κρίνεσιν ἀργεννοῖς ὁμοῦ.

F 3 Suda

ὑπάρχων: 'initiating'.

As not initiating, but seeking retribution,

a proverb. The verse is Chaeremon's, from *Thersites*.

DIONYSUS

F 4 Aristotle, *Rhetoric*

Another kind of argument is based on a person's name, as for example . . . *(examples including Soph.* Tyro *F 658, Eur.* Trojan Women *990)* . . . and as Chaeremon,

Pentheus, named for coming calamity.

F 5 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* (following **F 9** and *Centaur* F 10)

And in Dionysus:

Ivy, lover of choruses, child of the year.

F 6 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* (following *Centaur* F 11)

And in his *Dionysus* the same poet said:

Cutting garlands, proclaimers of holy silence.

F 7 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*

And some again are called 'plaited garlands', as among the Alexandrians to this day. The tragedian Chaeremon mentions them in *Dionysus*, as follows:

. . . *(making?)* with ivy and narcissus triple-wound coils of plaited garlands.

THYESTES

F 8 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* (following **F 13**)

And in *Thyestes*:

bright-gleaming roses together with white lilies.

F 9a, 10, 11 *are from the* Centaur *(see above, p. 93 and* ***F 14b*** *below).*

ΙΩ

The subject can only be guessed. Io, daughter of Inachus of Argos, was transformed into a cow either by Hera to frustrate Zeus's attentions to her, or by Zeus to protect her from Hera's anger. She was guarded by the many-eyed giant Argos until Hermes killed him, then wandered the earth harassed by a gadfly, and finally reached Egypt where Zeus relieved her and impregnated her with Epaphus, ancestor of Danaus and the Argive dynasty which included Perseus and Heracles. The only other recorded tragedy about her is Accius's Latin Io*, with three minimal fragments; it featured Io after her transformation, possibly conversing with Prometheus as in the Aeschylean* Prometheus Bound*.*[18] *Old*

F 9 Athenaeus 13.608d

ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἰοῖ ἔαρος τέκνα προσηγόρευε τὰ ἄνθη·

ἀνθηροῦ τέκνα

ἔαρος πέριξ στρώσαντες.

MINYAI

The Minyae were early inhabitants of Greece, vaguely remembered in its history, legends and genealogies and associated especially with the cities of Orchomenos in Boeotia and Iolcos in Thessaly (»» Fowler 2013, 191–94, 205f.). Chaeremon's play is usually thought to have involved the Argonauts, who could be identified collectively as Minyans since many (including Jason) were said to have been of Minyan descent (Pindar, Pyth*. 4.69 with Schol., Ap. Rhod. 1.228–33). This might find some confirmation if the play included a reference to the sufferings of Prometheus, which are witnessed by the Argonauts in Apollonius's* Argonautica *(2.1246–59), but the only evidence for such a reference in Chaeremon's play was a mistaken restoration of the text in a papyrus*

[18] Horace, *Ars Poetica* 124 lists 'wandering Io' (*Io vaga*) as an appropriate tragic subject (cf. Latte 1925, 3).

F 9a, 10, 11 *See opposite.*

IO

Comedies by Plato and Sannyrion are known through one uninformative fragment each. Some fourth-century vase-paintings showing Io amongst satyrs and in human form except for two small horns seem to have a dramatic origin and are included in TrGF *2 as adesp. F 5b.*[19] *C. W. Müller (1986) suggested that later depictions of Argos and Io together in youthful human form could derive from a related dramatic plot, possibly by Chaeremon, in which Argos's love for her led to his death. Thus Chaeremon's play could have been the model for Accius's tragedy or for a tragedy or satyr-play about Zeus's or Argos's love for Io. See further the note on* ***F 9****.*

F 9 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* (following **F 1**)

And in *Io* he called flowers 'spring's children':

> having strewn all around the children of blossoming spring.

MINYANS

fragment of Philodemus, On Piety. [20] *The Argonautic subject thus remains merely possible, and* ***F 12*** *possibly a description of Jason. An obvious alternative is the conflict of Heracles with the Minyans of Orchomenos and their king Erginos. This was probably the subject of Aeschylus's satyr-play* Kerykes (Heralds), *and Achaeus's* Erginos *may also have been a satyr-play (Vol. 1, p. 107), though the story could have provided material for a tragedy.*

---

[19] See *LIMC* V.1, 'Io I' nos 56, 59, 60; connection with Chaeremon is suggested by Yalouris there (pp. 675f.) and others. Sophocles' *Inachus* is probably not relevant since in that play Io has been more radically transformed (F 269a. 36–43) and may not have appeared on stage at all.

[20] P. Herc. 1088 II, col. 1.7–17, from an Epicurean criticism of poets' accounts of punishments suffered by gods, here Prometheus. Philippson (1920, 245) restored lines 7–9 as Χαι[ρήμων δ' ἐν τα]ῖς Μ̣[ινυάσιν ἐκ]τιθε[ῖ . . . ('and Chaeremon in *Minyans* expounds . . . ') and Snell printed this doubtfully as a possible F 12a, but the text of line 7 as recorded in the Naples drawing was]ιστ[, not]ισμ[(cf. Schober 1923/1988, 92, Luppe 1983, 52 n. 19, Radt in *TrGF* 3, 307).

F 12 Athenaeus 13.608f

ἐν δὲ Μινύαις·

πολλὴν ὀπώραν Κύπριδος εἰσορᾶν παρῆν
ἁβραῖσι περκάζουσαν οἰνάνθαις γένυν.

ἁβραῖσι Meineke ἄκραισι Ath. γένυν Kaibel χρόνου Ath. χρόα Wilamowitz χνόου Radt in Stephanopoulos 1990, 37

[**F 12a** *is not related to* Minyans*: see footnote 20.*]

ΟΔΥΣΣΕΥΣ

Known tragedies about Odysseus include a probable tetralogy of Aeschylus based on the Odyssey *(*Psychagogoi/Ghost-raisers, Penelope, Ostologoi/Bone-gatherers, Circe*); Sophocles'* Odysseus Acanthoplêx *(*Wounded by the Spine*, about his death: see on Astydamas II* ***F 1b****) and* Odysseus Mainomenos *(*Mad*, i.e. pretending madness to avoid the Troj-*

F 13 Athenaeus 13.608e

περὶ δὲ ῥόδων ἐν Ὀδυσσεῖ φησιν οὕτως·

κόμαισιν ὡρῶν θρέμματ' εὐανθῆ ῥόδα
εἶχον, τιθήνημ' ἔαρος ἐκπρεπέστατον.

θρέμματ' Nauck σώματ' Ath.

ΟΙΝΕΥΣ

The play is known only from Athenaeus's comment and quotation. Oeneus was the father of Meleager, Deianeira and others by his first wife Althaea, and of Tydeus by a second wife Periboea. He caused the ravages of the Calydonian boar and their consequences by neglecting to sacrifice to Artemis, and in later life was deposed and mistreated by his brother Agrius and his sons, rescued by Tydeus's son Diomedes who killed most of his persecutors, and eventually killed by Agrius's surviving sons. In some early traditions Oeneus's rescuer was Tydeus himself, who killed some or all of his father's persecutors (variously identified)

F 12 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* (following **F 8**)

And in *Minyans*:

> You could see Cypris's late-summer ripeness in abundance, darkening in delicate bloom upon his cheek.

[**F 12a** *See opposite.*]

ODYSSEUS

an War); and an unattributed Odysseus Pseudangelos *(*False Newsbringer*) about his disguised return to challenge the Suitors, which could be Chaeremon's play.*[21] *The Suda's entry for Apollodorus of Tarsus (*TrGF *no. 64) lists* Odysseus *and* Acanthoplêx *as separate titles, perhaps mistakenly.*

F 13 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* (following **F 5**)

And about roses he says thus in *Odysseus*:

> In their hair they wore the seasons' nurselings, fine-bloomed roses, spring's most beauteous tendance.

OENEUS

and because of the bloodshed went in exile to Argos.[22] *The name Oeneus suggests wine (*oinos*), and Oeneus was sometimes identified as the recipient of Dionysus's gift of the vine to mankind. A different and mythically obscure Oeneus, also associated with Dionysus, was the eponymous hero of the Attic tribe Oineis. »»* LIMC *VII, 'Oineus', Gantz 1993, 116f., 168, 328f., 334f., Fowler 2013, 135 n. 48, 136–39.*

---

[21] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1455a12–16 = *TrGF* adesp. F 7b. Recent comments on Aristotle's cryptic remarks there: Hall 2008, 509, Karamanou 2019, 68f. See also adesp. F 7a.

[22] [Hesiod] fr. 10a.51–57 M–W = 10.51–57 Most, Apollodorus 1.8.5 and Schol. D *Iliad* 14.119, Pherecydes F 122a–b Fowler, with Fowler 2013, 138f., 409f. The various traditions are summarized by Schierl 2006, 426–28.

Euripides' Oeneus *seems to have been about the restoration by Diomedes (»» Collard–Cropp 2008b, 28–39). The tragedies with this name by Philocles I (title only: see* ***T 1*** *in Vol. 1) and Chaeremon could have treated that episode (as did Accius's Latin* Diomedes*),*[23] *but the traditions obviously allow other possibilities. Sophocles probably produced a satyr-play* Oeneus *about the contest for the hand of Deianeira (»»* GrSat *368–74, O'Sullivan–Collard 2013, 378–83). Pacuvius's* Periboea*, prob-*

F 14 Athenaeus 13.608a–b

καὶ ὑμῖν δέ, ὦ ἑταῖροι, λέγω ὅτι οὐδέν ἐστιν ὀφθαλμῶν οὕτως εὐφραντικὸν ὡς γυναικὸς κάλλος. ὁ γοῦν τοῦ τραγικοῦ Χαιρήμονος Οἰνεὺς περὶ παρθένων τινῶν διηγούμενος ὧν ἐθεᾶτό φησιν ἐν τῷ ὁμωνύμῳ δράματι·

(Oiv.) ἔκειτο δ' ἡ μὲν λευκὸν εἰς σεληνόφως
φαίνουσα μαστὸν λελυμένης ἐπωμίδος,
τῆς δ' αὖ χορεία λαγόνα τὴν ἀριστερὰν
ἔλυσε· γυμνὴ δ' αἰθέρος θεάμασιν
ζῶσαν γραφὴν ἔφαινε, χρῶμα δ' ὄμμασιν
λευκὸν μελαίνης ἔργον ἀντηύγει σκιᾶς.
ἄλλη δ' ἐγύμνου καλλίχειρας ὠλένας,
ἄλλης προσαμπέχουσα θῆλυν αὐχένα·
ἡ δὲ ῥαγέντων χλανιδίων ὑπὸ πτυχαῖς
ἔφαινε μηρόν, κἀξεπεσφραγίζετο
ὥρας γελώσης χωρὶς ἐλπίδων ἔρως.
ὑπνωμέναι δ' ἔπιπτον ἑλενίων ἔπι,
ἴων τε μελανόφυλλα συγκλῶσαι πτερὰ
κρόκον θ', ὃς ἡλιῶδες εἰς ὑφάσματα
πέπλων σκιᾶς εἴδωλον ἐξωμόργνυτο,
[ἔρσῃ δὲ θαλερὸς ἐκτραφεὶς ἀμάρακος]
λειμῶσι μαλακοῖς ἐξέτεινον αὐχένας.

9 δὲ ῥαγέντων Meineke (δ' ἐκραγ- Casaubon) δεκλαγεν τῶν Ath. 12 ὑπνωμέναι Lobeck (ὑπνούμεναι Collard) ὑπτω- Ath. 15 ἐξωμόργνυτο Meineke εισομόργνυται Ath. 16 del. Meineke (16–17 assigned to *Alphesiboea* by Friebel) ἔρσῃ Bergk πέρσης Ath. 17 μαλακοῖς Grotius μαλθακοῖσιν Ath. μαλακοὺς ἐξέτεινεν (retaining 16) Scaliger, Wilamowitz

[23] The well-known Paestan vase from the 340s showing Agrius bound on an altar and at the mercy of Diomedes and Oeneus (Taplin 2007 no. 70, pp. 198f.) might then have been inspired by Chaeremon's play rather than Euripides'.

ably based on a Greek model, may have been about the restoration by Tydeus; it involved bacchic activity and a woman (Periboea?) taking refuge in a sanctuary of Dionysus.[24] *A Dionysiac theme for Chaeremon's play would be plausible if* ***F 14*** *describes sleeping maenads, but that is uncertain and the dramatic context of the fragment is unguessable (see on* ***F 14*** *below).*

The papyrus fragments TrGF *adesp. F 625 have sometimes been ascribed (improbably) to Chaeremon's* Oeneus*.*

F 14 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*

And I tell you, my friends, there is nothing so pleasurable to the eyes as a woman's beauty. Thus the tragedian Chaeremon's Oeneus, telling of some girls he was watching, says in the play of that name:

> One lay displaying a breast into the pale moonlight, her shoulder-piece undone. Dancing had set another's left flank free, and thus exposed she showed to heaven's gaze a living picture, her pale skin[5] illumined to the eye against the darkness. Another had her lovely arms laid bare, clasping to her another's tender neck, while she beneath the folds of her torn dress displayed a thigh; her smiling beauty's allure[10] sealed her off, secluded from hopes. Sleep-struck they fell on flowers of calamint, and pressing together violets' dark petals and crocus that smudged a sun-bright shadow-image into their robes' weavings,[15] *[and the flourishing marjoram, nurtured by dew]* they lay with necks extended on the lush meadow.

[24] frs 18–20 D'Anna, 220–222 Schierl. On the play's subject see D'Anna 140–44, Schierl 428–32.

INCERTAE FABULAE

F 14b *probably consists of verses from the* Centaur *(above, p. 93 with note 8).*

F 15 Athenaeus 2.35d

Χαιρήμων δὲ ὁ τραγῳδὸς παρασκευάζειν φησὶ τὸν οἶνον τοῖς χρωμένοις

γέλωτα, σοφίαν, ἀμαθίαν, εὐβουλίαν.

ἀμαθίαν Wagner εὐμ- Ath.

F 16

(a) [Aristotle], *Problems* 3.16 (~ Plutarch, *Moralia* 406b)

Διὰ τί ὁ οἶνος καὶ τετυφωμένους ποιεῖ καὶ μανικούς; ἐναντία γὰρ ἡ διάθεσις· ὁ μὲν γὰρ μᾶλλον ἤδη ἐν κινήσει, ὁ δὲ ἧττον. ἢ ὥσπερ Χαιρήμων εἶπε,

τῶν χρωμένων γὰρ τοῖς τρόποις κεράννυται.

(b) Athenaeus 13.562e

Θεόφραστος δ' ἐν τῷ Ἐρωτικῷ Χαιρήμονά φησι τὸν τραγικὸν λέγειν, ὡς τὸν οἶνον τῶν χρωμένων ⟨τοῖς τρόποις⟩ κεράννυσθαι, οὕτως καὶ τὸν Ἔρωτα, ὃς μετριάζων μέν ἐστιν εὔχαρις, ἐπιτεινόμενος δὲ καὶ διαταράττων χαλεπώτατος.

F 17 Athenaeus 2.43c

τὸ ὕδωρ ποταμοῦ σῶμά φησί που Εὔβουλος ὁ κωμῳδοποιὸς εἰρηκέναι Χαιρήμονα τὸν τραγικόν·

ἐπεὶ δὲ σηκῶν περιβολὰς ἠμείψαμεν
ὕδωρ τε ποταμοῦ σῶμα διεπεράσαμεν . . .

F 18 Stobaeus 1.4.2a

Χαιρήμονος·

Χρεία δ' Ἀνάγκης οὐκ ἀπῴκισται πολύ.

F 19 Stobaeus 1.6.15

Χαιρήμονος·

ἅπαντα νικᾷ καὶ μεταστρέφει τύχη.

F 20 Stobaeus 1.8.30

Χαιρήμονος·

σχολῇ βαδίζων ὁ χρόνος ἀφικνεῖται τὸ πᾶν.

τὸ πᾶν Grotius ταν Stob.

UNIDENTIFIED PLAYS

F 14b *See opposite.*

F 15 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*

Chaeremon the tragedian says that wine imparts to its users

> laughter, wisdom, foolishness, good counsel.

F 16

(a) [Aristotle], *Problems*

Why does wine make people both stupefied and manic? Because the disposition (of each) is opposite; the one (i.e. the one who becomes manic) is already volatile, the other less so. Or as Chaeremon says,

> (Wine) is mixed with the temperaments of its users.

(b) Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*

Theophrastus in his *Erotikos* (fr. 107 Wimmer) says that Chaeremon says that, as wine is mixed with the temperaments of its users, so also is Eros, who when he is moderate is gracious but when intense and disruptive is very difficult.

F 17 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*

Eubulus the comic poet says somewhere (fr. 128 *PCG*) that Chaeremon the tragedian has called water 'a river's body':

> When we had passed the sheepfold fences and crossed the water,
> a river's body . . .

F 18 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On divinely willed necessity'

Chaeremon:

> Poverty dwells not far from Necessity.

F 19 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On fortune'

Chaeremon:

> Fortune overcomes and reverses everything.

F 20 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On the nature of time etc.'

Chaeremon:

> Time strolls unhurried but gets there all the same.

F 21 Stobaeus 1.8.4 (without lemma) and 1.8.32

Χαιρήμονος·

οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὅ τι
οὐκ ἐν χρόνῳ ζητοῦσιν ἐξευρίσκεται.

F 22 Stobaeus 1.8.33

τοῦ αὐτοῦ (*sc.* Χαιρήμονος)·

χρόνος μαλάσσει πάντα κἀξεργάζεται.

F 23 Stobaeus 3.3.17, ed. Trincavelli (line 2 only in mss. MA, 1 and 2 repeated or paraphrased separately in later sources. See note below.)

Χαιρήμονος·

τό τοι κράτιστον πανταχοῦ τιμητέον·
ὁ γὰρ φρονῶν εὖ πάντα συλλαβὼν ἔχει.

F 24 Stobaeus 3.4.14

Χαιρήμονος·

οὐ ζῶσιν οἵ τι μὴ συνιέντες σοφόν.

F 25 Stobaeus 3.4.15

τοῦ αὐτοῦ (*sc.* Χαιρήμονος)·

πρὶν γὰρ φρονεῖν εὖ καταφρονεῖν ἐπίστασαι.

F 26 Stobaeus 3.4.17

τοῦ αὐτοῦ (*sc.* Χαιρήμονος)·

σφαλεὶς γὰρ οὐδεὶς εὖ βεβουλεῦσθαι δοκεῖ.

F 27 Stobaeus 3.12.15

Χαιρήμονος·

ψευδῆ δὲ τοῖς ἐσθλοῖσιν οὐ πρέπει λέγειν.

F 28 Stobaeus 3.20.15

Χαιρήμονος·

ἡγοῦ δ’ ἐν ὀργῇ πάντα γίγνεσθαι κακά.

F 29 Stobaeus 3.20.16 (and elsewhere without attribution)

τοῦ αὐτοῦ (*sc.* Χαιρήμονος)·

ὀργὴ δὲ πολλὰ δρᾶν ἀναγκάζει κακά.

F 21 Stobaeus (as **F 20**)
Chaeremon:

> There's nothing in human affairs that is not found out in time by those who seek it.

F 22 Stobaeus (as **F 20**)
The same (i.e. Chaeremon):

> Time softens and works out everything.

F 23 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On good sense'
Chaeremon:

> One should value the best course in every case. A man of good sense gathers and considers everything.

F 24 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On foolishness'
Chaeremon:

> Those with no understanding of anything wise are not alive.

F 25 Stobaeus (as **F 24**)
The same (i.e. Chaeremon):

> You've learned contempt before you've learned good sense.

F 26 Stobaeus (as **F 24**)
The same (i.e. Chaeremon):

> No one who has failed is thought to have planned well.

F 27 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On lying'
Chaeremon:

> It's unbecoming for good people to tell lies.

F 28 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On anger'
Chaeremon:

> Consider that all evils begin in anger.

F 29 Stobaeus (as **F 28**)
The same (i.e. Chaeremon):

> Anger compels people to do many bad things.

F 30 Stobaeus 3.22.10

Χαιρήμονος·

ὅλως τὸ κρεῖσσον οὐκ ἐᾷ φρονεῖν μέγα.

F 31 Stobaeus 4.5.4

Χαιρήμονος·

σοφῶν γὰρ ἀνδρῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας καλῶς
κρίνειν, τὸ δ' εἰκῆ καὶ μετὰ σπουδῆς κακόν.

F 32 Stobaeus 4.22.50 (and derivatives; elsewhere without attribution)

Χαιρήμονος·

γυναῖκα θάπτειν κρεῖσσόν ἐστιν ἢ γαμεῖν.

F 33 Stobaeus 4.25.25

Χαιρήμονος·

γένοιτό μοι τὰς χάριτας ἀποδοῦναι πατρί.

F 34 *An excerpt lost from the text of Stobaeus 4.25, 'That parents should be properly honoured etc.'*

F 35 Stobaeus 4.26.14 (and elsewhere without attribution)

Χαιρήμονος·

πρὸς υἱὸν ὀργὴν οὐκ ἔχει χρηστὸς πατήρ.

F 36 Stobaeus 4.31.9

Χαιρήμονος·

πλοῦτος δὲ πρὸς μὲν τὰς †ὅλας† τιμὰς ἰὼν
οὐκ ἔσχεν ὄγκον ὥστε καὶ δόξης τυχεῖν,
ἀλλ' ἔστ' ἄσεμνος· ἐν δὲ δώμασιν βροτῶν
ἡδὺς σύνοικος καί τιν' εἰληχὼς χάριν.

1 πόλεως Meineke 3 ἔστ' ἄσεμνος Hermann, Tucker ἔστι σεμνός Stob. δώμασιν Hense δόσει or δώσει Stob. 4 σύνοικος Cropp συνοικεῖν Stob. συνοικῶν West

F 37 Stobaeus 4.44.3

Χαιρήμονος·

οὐδεὶς ἐπὶ σμικροῖσι λυπεῖται σοφός.

F 30 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, ‘On arrogance’

Chaeremon:

The higher power absolutely forbids pride.

F 31 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, ‘On governing’

Chaeremon:

Judging offences well is an attribute of wise men. Judging them thoughtlessly and hastily is bad.

F 32 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, ‘On marriage’

Chaeremon:

Burying a wife is better than marrying her.

F 33 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, ‘That parents should be properly honoured by their children etc.’

Chaeremon:

May I get to return my father’s favours to me!

F 34 *See opposite.*

F 35 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, ‘How fathers should behave towards their children etc.’

Chaeremon:

A good father does not nurse anger against a son.

F 36 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, ‘Praise of wealth’

Chaeremon:

Wealth, when it goes towards the †*whole*† offices, does not have eminence so as to attain prestige, and is without dignity. But in men’s houses it’s a pleasant companion and endowed with a certain charm.

F 37 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, ‘That one must bear one’s fortunes nobly etc.’

Chaeremon:

No one who is wise grieves over small things.

F 38 Stobaeus 4.50b.60

Χαιρήμονος·

γέρων γὰρ ὀργῇ πᾶς ὑπηρετεῖν κακός.

F 39 Theophrastus, *Hist. Plant.* 5.9.4

δύσκαπνα δὲ τῷ γένει μὲν ὅλως τὰ ὑγρά . . . ἐκ δὲ τῆς ἰδίας φύσεως ὁ φοῖνιξ, ὃν δὴ καὶ μάλιστά τινες ὑπειλήφασι δύσκαπνον· ὅθεν καὶ Χαιρήμων ἐποίησε·

τοῦ τε δυσκαπνωτάτου
φοίνικος ἐκ γῆς ῥιζοφοιτητοὺς φλέβας.

F 40 *See note on **F 23***

F 41? Cocondrius, *On tropes* 11 (*Rhet.Gr.* III.236 Spengel)

αἴνιγμά ἐστι λέξις ἢ λόγος ἀποκρύπτων τὸ νοούμενον διὰ τὰ ἀνακεχωρηκότα τῶν συμβεβηκότων, οἷόν ἐστι Χαιρήμονος·

ἔαρος ἡ νύμφη τεκνοῦται μετὰ θέρους ἐς ὕστερον,
ἐν χειμῶνι δ' οἴχεται σὺν τῷ ἀνέμῳ κεκαρμένη.

ἄμπελον γὰρ δηλοῖ διὰ τούτου.

1 τεκνοῦται Schneidewin τέκνον τι Cocondr. ἐς Schneidewin εἰς Cocondr.

F 42 Menander, *Aspis* 425ff.

Δα. *τὰς γὰρ συμφορὰς*
ἀπροσδοκήτους δαίμον[ες δι]ώρισαν.
Εὐριπίδου τοῦτ' ἐστί, τὸ δὲ Χαιρήμονος,
οὐ τῶν τυχόντων.

F 43 *The 'Chaeremonian' verse (*× – ⏑ – × – ⏑ – × – ⏑ – – – × – ⏑ – ⏑ – –*) cited in the so-called Fragmenta Bobiensia (*Gramm. Lat. *VI.2, 620 Keil)*

F 38 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'Censure of old age'

Chaeremon:

> Every old man is bad at serving anger.

F 39 Theophrastus, *Enquiry into Plants*

Damp wood generally produces a foul smoke . . . and palm-wood does so naturally (i.e. even when dry); in fact some people regard it as giving the foulest smoke of all. Thus Chaeremon wrote:

> veins of the most foul-smoked palm, root-wandering out of earth.

F 40 *See note on* ***F 23***

F 41? Cocondrius, *On tropes*

An *ainigma* is an expression or word which conceals what is meant through obscurities of meanings, for example Chaeremon's:

> Spring's bride bears offspring later with summer's aid. In winter she is dead, now shorn with the wind.

By this he indicates the vine.

F 42 Menander, *The Shield*

Daos. *The gods determined that disasters be unforeseen.*

That one was Euripides' (i.e. *Orestes* 1f. quoted previously), this one Chaeremon's — no ordinary poets!

F 43 *See opposite.*

Notes on Chaeremon

T 1

The Suda's information is all derived from Athenaeus and somewhat confused. Athenaeus 13.562 consists mainly of comic fragments concerning *erôs* (love), but the series is interrupted by Theophrastus's mention of Chaeremon **F 16** (see text there) and an unattributed quotation from Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis*, both arbitrarily inserted between Alexis F 20 and Alexis F 236. The latter is ascribed to 'the same poet in his play entitled *The Wounded Man*', and a careless reading suggests that this was a title of Chaeremon (the last poet Athenaeus has named) rather than Alexis. The description of Chaeremon as a comic poet probably reflects the same confusion. The Suda's other titles are all taken from Athenaeus 13.608, the source of most of the fragments of these plays, omitting *Io*.

T 3

See above, p. 92 on the style of Chaeremon discussed here. Licymnius was a late 5th-century poet and rhetorician, known only from a handful of testimonia and fragments (»» Radermacher 1951, 117–19, Campbell 1993, 32–39).

Aristotle's remarks have often been taken to mean that Chaeremon's plays were not intended for public performance, but this is clearly mistaken (»» Zwierlein 1966, 128–34 with references to older interpretations, 129 n. 1). His point is simply that the 'agonistic' style is more appropriate than the 'written' style for agonistic contexts because it is more dramatic and has more immediate impact. There would be no point in saying that Chaeremon's style was less appropriate for public performance if his plays were never intended for that, nor in saying that actors avoid plays intended purely for reading. It is also very unlikely that Licymnius wrote dithyrambs for reading. Aristotle's distinction is repeated in Demetrius, *On Style* 193 (quoted by Zwierlein 129): ἐναγώνιος μὲν οὖν ἴσως μᾶλλον ἡ διαλελυμένη λέξις, ἡ δ' αὐτὴ καὶ ὑποκριτικὴ καλεῖται, κινεῖ γὰρ ὑπόκρισιν ἡ λύσις. γραφικὴ δὲ λέξις ἡ εὐανάγνωστος. αὕτη δ' ἐστὶν ἡ συνηρτημένη καὶ οἷον ἠσφαλισμένη τοῖς συνδέσμοις. διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ Μένανδρον ὑποκρίνονται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις, Φιλήμονα δὲ ἀναγινώσκουσιν, 'The uncoordinated style is perhaps more suitable for public debate; it is also called dramatic, for the absence of coordination encourages dramatic delivery. Written style, on the other hand, is easy to read. This is coherent and, as it were, made secure by its connections. And for this reason people perform Menander, who is often uncoordinated, but read Philemon.'

As Zwierlein also notes, Aristotle's remarks do presuppose that reading was a well established mode of experiencing dramatic texts, as is evident also from e.g. *Poetics* 1450b18–20, 1462a11–14 (Dionysus reads Euripides' *Andromeda* in Ar. *Frogs* 52f.). Diogenes of Sinope probably wrote his tragedies for readers, but

with a specific philosophical purpose (below, pp. 203–5). See also on the Pleiad (p. 273f.) and Ezechiel (p. 318).

T 3a

From Book 2 of Philodemus, *On Poems*. Here Philodemus is restating and rebutting the arguments of the Euphonist Heracleodorus (late 3rd C. BC?: cf. above on Carcinus **T 7**), who apparently held that the specific virtue of poetic art, and hence the only one by which poetry should be judged good or bad, is artistic composition (*synthesis*), i.e. the well-sounding and hence evocative arrangement of words, regardless of the nature of its subject-matter (Janko 136–39 summarizes his theory). These excerpts indicate that in Heracleodorus's view Chaeremon's deficiencies in composition made his poetry 'bad' (or at least not consistently good) despite its admirable content. The first sentence in col. 7 suggests that Philodemus agreed that Chaeremon's verses were not all well composed. The paraphrases in col. 7 (second sentence) and col. 33 are F 28 and F 38–39 in Janko's edition of the fragments of Heracleodorus, Janko 2020, 514–17.

F 1

The fragment follows **F 14** in Athenaeus 13.608, and is followed there by **F 9**, F 10 (from the *Centaur*), **F 5**, **F 13**, **F 8** and **F 12**; thus two excerpts describing beautiful women (**F 14**, **F 1**) are followed by six describing flowers etc. (although **F 12** is actually a metaphor: see note there). The text of Athenaeus introduces **F 1** as referring to a flower but it clearly describes a beautiful young woman (not metaphorically a flower as argued by Cataudella 1929, cf. Snell 1971, 165 and *TrGF* app., Russo 2008, 132–36). The comment belongs with the following excerpts (**F 5** etc.) which seem to have been provoked by the flower descriptions in the last six lines of **F 14** and roughly inserted into what is suppposed to be a discussion of female beauty (the topic is resumed after the quotation of **F 12**). There are no good grounds for combining **F 1** with parts of **F 14** (Russo 132f. lists such suggestions) since their subjects are quite different: **F 1** does not describe a night-time scene and its statuesque girl is not sleeping. For these points and detailed discussions of the fragment see Collard 2007, 41–43, 54, Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 79–84, Piatkowski 1981, Primavesi 2003, 224–26, Magnani 2015. The 'living statue' simile of lines 5–7 is anticipated in Euripides' descriptions of Polyxena at her sacrifice (*Hec.* 560f.) and Andromeda bound to the rock (F 125), the aesthetics of which are discussed by Stieber 2011, 145–51, 400–7.

The young woman described here could be Callirhoe, daughter of the river-god Achelous, whom Alcmeon married after being purified by her father, and who caused his death by sending him to retrieve the necklace of Harmonia from

his first wife Alphesiboea: cf. Collard 42, Primavesi 224f., the latter suggesting a description of Alcmeon's first sight of Callirhoe.

1–2. Her body's †*appearances* etc.: the girl's pale skin 'gleams', just as the bacchant's naked flank 'shines' in the verbally similar **F 14**.5f. The verb στίλβω describes lustrous skin, e.g. *Iliad* 3.392, *Odyssey* 6.237, Theocr. 2.79.

[The two verses are unmetrical and incoherent; some text may be missing between them. For details and history of conjectures see the discussions cited above with Liapis 2017a. In line 1 Hermann suggested σώματ' ἐς μὲν ὄψιν ἀντηυγάζετο, 'her body shone back to one's sight' (cf. ἀντηύγει in **F 14**.6, but the middle form is unparalleled); Primavesi σώματος μὲν ὄψαν' εἰσηυγάζετο (ὄψαν(α) Jacobs), 'he observed the spectacle of her body', but the parallels are remote (ὄψανον Aesch. *Cho.* 534, εἶδος ἐσαυγάζων *Anth.Pal.* 5.106.5) and a subject 'he' is inappropriate (Liapis 152f. adds further objections). In line 2 διαπρεπῆ is plausible in itself and is best scanned ⏑⏑ ⏑ –, hence either στίλβοντα λευκῷ – ⏑ – ⏑ διαπρεπῆ or more likely στίλβοντα λευκῷ διαπρεπῆ x – ⏑ – (cf. Eur. *Alc.* 642, *Supp.* 841, F 185.3, [Eur.] *Rhes*. 617). Liapis's radical rewriting (καὶ σώματ' ἐς μὲν ὄψιν ἐξεχρῴζετο | στίλβοντα λευκανθεῖ τε χρωτὶ διαπρεπῆ, 'And their bodies had acquired (such) a hue in their aspect, (that they appeared) gleaming and prominent for their white skin'), is grammatically questionable[25] and cannot be right since lines 5–7 (**as of a statue etc.**) make it clear that this is a description of a single young woman.**]**

3–4. modesty tempered it etc.: blushing is conventionally associated with modesty in a young woman or man, e.g. Eur. *Pho*. 1487–9, Xen. *Cyrop.* 1.4.4, Ap. Rhod. 1.791, *Anacreontea* 17.20; Pfeiffer on Callimachus fr. 80.10.

5–7. her wax-blonde hair etc.: Wilamowitz's κηρόχρωτος, making the statue (or possibly just its hair) blonde, is inappopriate. The girl's blonde hair is contrasted with her pale but blushing skin, but the statue's hair is simply a feature of its fine craftsmanship (»» Primavesi 225f.). **rustling:** ξουθός may suggest sound as well as motion. Silk 1983, 317–19 discusses the various senses of this 'iconym', a word whose meaning varies with context. Colour is irrelevant here since the word refers to **breezes**.

F 2

The verse is often quoted or paraphrased as proverbial by later authors (see citations with the text of **F 2** above and e.g. Nauck 1889, 782f., Morelli 2001, 77–79, 165–67, Tosi 2017, 731f.). The same thought is expressed in terms of

[25] ἐξεχρῴζετο is imperfect 'was acquiring a hue', not 'had acquired a hue', and hardly suits pale skin. λευκανθής is not a mere synonym for λευκός; it means 'white-blooming' and is apt for growing hair (Soph. *OT* 742) or burgeoning smoke (Pind. *Nem.* 9.23) but again hardly for pale skin. Line 2 is more likely one phrase ('gleaming conspicuous(ly)') than two ('gleaming *and* prominent').

divine influence rather than 'fortune' by Pindar, *Pyth.* 8.73–76; cf. Agathon **F 20** n., Diogenes Sinop. **F 2** n. Planning (*euboulia*) and divine favour can both be considered important, e.g. Theognis 328f., Isocrates 1.34. For the power of fortune in general see e.g. **F 19** below, Soph. *Ant.* 1158–60, Pl. *Laws* 709a–b (*tuchê* guided by God). There is no point in guessing at Chaeremon's speaker or context.[26] In the fictitious 'Letter of Polyidus to Darius' (*PSI* 1285 II 12ff.: Merkelbach 1977, 237) Polyidus quotes the verse as a proverb and adds, 'For the planning of so many great men would have availed nothing against the all-daring might of Alexander, even if the cunning Odysseus had assisted them'. Snell suggested this might indicate a role for Odysseus in Chaeremon's play (Snell 1971, 168 n. 27), but the letter mentions Odysseus merely as the archetypal strategist.

F 3

Probably Diomedes justifying his attack on Achilles, or perhaps Achilles justifying his attack on Thersites (»» Morelli 167f.). Chaeremon's play is not the earliest source of the 'proverb'; it appears in Aristarchus **F 4** (Vol. 1, p. 62). οὐχ ὑπάρχων etc. also appears in the prooemium of Apollodorus *Against Neaera* ([Dem.] 59.1, late 340s), while the proverb-collection of Zenobius (6.51 = Zenob. Ath. 2.49) cites it with the comment, 'Menander recalls (μέμνηται) this in *The Woman from Olynthus*' (fr. 259 *PCG*). Bühler commenting on Zenobius (1999, 119–22) cites many examples of this and similar antitheses deployed in forensic and other contexts ('not initiating but defending myself' etc.) from the fifth century and later, and suggests that the 'proverb' originated in common parlance rather than any one literary source.

F 4

An ominous interpretation of Pentheus's name (*penthos*, 'grief') as in Eur. *Bacch.* 367f., 507f. Elmsley's assignment of the fragment to *Dionysus* is generally accepted.

F 5

Ivy was sacred to the god Dionysus, ivy-wreaths worn by his worshippers in their ritual dancing, e.g. Eur. *Bacch.* 205, 323, Philodamus, *Paean to Dionysus* 146f.: »» Dodds on Eur. *Bacch.* 81. **child of the year:** i.e. growing throughout the year, evergreen (Dodds *ibid.*).

[26] Xanthaki-Karamanou 2017, 219 suggests the speaker was Achilles claiming that he attacked Thersites on impulse.

F 6

Cited in Athenaeus's discussion of garlands, 15.669c–686c, along with *Centaur* F 11: στεφάνους ἑτοιμάζουσιν, οὓς εὐφημίας | κήρυκας εὐχαῖς προὐβάλοντο δαιμόνων, 'they prepare(d) garlands, which they set forth as heralds of holy silence for their prayers'. Both fragments refer to the donning of garlands in preparation for prayers and sacrifice to be performed in **holy silence** (*euphêmia* is 'well-speaking', i.e. avoiding the risk of ill-omened speech). **Cutting garlands:** i.e. cutting and trimming the flowers to be used in making them, cf. Eur. *El.* 778, Theocr. 18.40 with Gow 1950, 358.

F 7

From a later point in Athenaeus's discussion of garlands. **triple-wound coils etc.:** lit. 'triple-spirals in a circle (consisting) of plaited garlands'. Nauck's conjecture makes a simpler phrase, 'triple-spiral circles', but is unneeded.

F 8

Perhaps referring again to a garland, cf. *Anacrontea* 51.6–8 ὅρα κἂν στεφάνοισιν | ὅπως πρέπει τὰ λευκὰ | ῥόδοις κρίνα πλακέντα, 'See in garlands too how well white lilies look when twined with roses'; Cratinus fr. 105.1f. *PCG* παντοίοις γε μὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνθέμοις ἐρέπτομαι | λειρίοις, ῥόδοις, κρίνεσιν κτλ, 'I crown my head with flowers of every kind, lilies, roses, white lilies etc.'. The language is refined (»» Xanthakis-Karamanos 92), **ὀξυφεγγῆ bright-gleaming** an invented compound, **ἀργεννοῖς** an epicism for **white** lilies (a phrasing echoed in late epigrams which probably drew on Athenaeus's quotation: *Anth.Pal.* 9.384.11, 15.35.1).

F 9

Possibly referring to a spring celebration in the sanctuary of Hera, where Io was a priestess; in Aesch. *Supp.* 538–40 she browses amongst flowers, watched by Argos, after her transformation. This might point to a play set in Argos (cf. Collard 37), but it could be a reminiscence of a past event, and the reference of the *masculine* participle **στρώσαντες** (**having strewn**) is unclear.

F 12

You could see Cypris's ripeness etc.: Athenaeus seems to have understood this as a description of ripening grapes, but in fact it is a metaphor modelled on Pindar, *Nem.* 5.6 οὔπω γένυσι φαίνων τερείνας ματέρ' οἰνάνθας ὀπώραν, 'not yet showing on his cheeks late summer, mother of the tender grape-bloom', *Isthm.* 2.5 Ἀφροδίτας εὐθρόνου μνάστειραν ἀδίσταν ὀπώραν, '(a beautiful youth's) most pleasing late-summer ripeness, wooer of fair-throned Aphrodite': »» Collard 2007, 39, 49 n. 21. **ὀπώρα** is the ripening season of late summer, here implying the onset of sexual maturity (in Aesch. *Supp.* 998, 1015 the maturity of

Danaus's daughters). **περκάζειν** normally denotes the darkening of maturing grapes but here the youth's early beard (metaphor as in Eur. *Cret.* F 472e.15 οἰνωπὸν . . . περ[καί]νων γένυν 'darkening with wine-like cheek', Callim. *Hymn* 5.75f. Τειρεσίας . . . ἄρτι γένεια περκάζων 'Tiresias lately darkening in cheeks'). **οἰνάνθαις**, lit. 'wine-blooms', seems to refer to the 'bloom' that darkens the ripening grape, although οἰνάνθη is more often the vine's fruit-bearing bloom ('inflorescence'). The onset of ripening and darkening ('veraison') is a crucial stage in grape development.

[In line 2 **ἀβραῖσι** (Meineke) is a very probable correction of ἄκραισι ('with grape-blooms' tips'); β and κ are very easily confused in early minuscule scripts. χρόνου gives poor sense ('with time's bloom'), and **γένυν** is very plausible (cf. Euripides and Callimachus above) except that the error is hard to explain. χρόα ('darkening . . . on his skin') and especially χνόου ('with a delicate grape-bloom of down') are closer to χρόνου but leave the location of the 'bloom' unspecified, unless this was done in a preceding verse. Pubic hair (of exercising Argonauts, West 1983a, 80, or a girl, Stephanopoulos 1988b, 11) is an unlikely alternative.**]**

F 13

the seasons' nurselings: cf. the personifications in **F 9** and **F 41**.

F 14

Athenaeus's leading example of the impact of female physical beauty is also the most notable example of Chaeremon's poetry. For detailed discussions (reflected in the notes below) see Snell 1971, 160–65, Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 71–78, Piatkowski 1981, Dolfi 2006, Collard 2007, 43–48, 54f., Carrara 2012.

The only indication of a context is that Oeneus was the speaker (and even this is queried by Carrara 199). The scene recalls Euripides' briefer description of sleeping maenads (*Bacchae* 683–88), and Collard and others have noted similarities of detail in 6th–4th century depictions of maenads. These comparisons suggest that Chaeremon's maidens are bacchants, but Dolfi points out that bacchic groups usually include older, married women, and that the equipment, clothing and other attributes of bacchic thiasoi are absent from this description; its sensuality and the floral scenery may rather suggest a group of maiden worshippers in the sanctuary of a goddess such as Aphrodite.[27] Dolfi also suggests that the description might have been part of a speech, possibly a prologue, in which the aged and oppressed Oeneus recalled a happier moment from his past. He does not elaborate this suggestion, and the description seems

[27] Carrara accepts Dolfi's suggestion. For arguments against a Dionysiac context see also Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 52f. The 'torn dress' of **F 14**.9f. might however suggest bacchic dancing (Collard 47, Xanthakis-Karamanos 75, Magnani 2015, 256f.).

too detailed for a prologue. The erotic tone and night-time setting suggest this may have been the prelude to an account of a seduction or rape (actions often connected with a *pannychis* or nocturnal ceremony). In one of the traditions about Tydeus's birth recorded by Apollodorus (1.8.5) Periboea's father Hipponous insisted on the marriage after Oeneus had made her pregnant with Tydeus.

1–2. displaying a breast into the pale moonlight: or possibly 'showing a pale breast to the moonlight' (Collard 44, Dolfi 44), but **λευκὸν εἰς σεληνόφως** makes a coherent phrase, and moonlight is conventionally 'pale' (»» Xanthakis-Karamanos 73f., Stephanopoulos 1984, 187f.)

4–5. she showed to heaven's gaze etc.: lit. 'to aether's viewings', stressing the scene's secluded natural setting; the unobserved narrator is the only human witness. The aether surrounding the earth could be regarded as divine and sentient, and could be called on as a witness, e.g. [Aesch.] *PV* 88–92, 1092 (seeing), Eur. *IA* 365 (hearing). Chaeremon develops the idea a little preciously, aether now being the viewer of a **living picture.** The partially clad girl seen as in a painting recalls Aesch. *Ag.* 242 (Iphigenia 'conspicuous as in pictures'), and verbally echoes Eur. *Hec.* 558–61 (Polyxena 'tore her robe open from shoulder to waist, displaying breasts and torso beautiful as a statue's': cf. on **F 1** above).

5–6. her pale skin illumined etc.: lit. 'and her pale skin shone back to the eyes, (this being) an effect of the dark shadow'; her moonlit body stood out in contrast with the surrounding darkness. The description evokes the pictorial technique of *skiagraphia* ('shadow-painting', probably something similar to *chiaroscuro*): »» Collard 46, Xanthakis-Karamanos 74f., *MusTr* 290 n. 12, Stieber 2011, 230f. **[μελαίνης ἔργον . . . σκιᾶς** is an internal accusative phrase in 'apposition to the sentence': »» Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 756, Kannicht in *TrGF* app.**]**

9–11. while she etc.: i.e. the second girl, her bared thigh contrasted with the first one's bared arms. The **dress** (χλανίδιον, diminutive of χλανίς) is a light outer garment, voluminous enough to be drawn over a woman's head as a veil (Eur. *Supp.* 110); **torn** perhaps during the girls' lively dancing rather than violently (»» Dolfi 52 n. 34), unless these are after all maenads. **displayed a thigh:** erotically suggestive, e.g. Ar. *Lys.* 551f. (Eros and Aphrodite breathe desire into women's breasts and thighs), *Eccl.* 901f. (girls' tender thighs), *Anth.Pal.* 12.161 (the girl Dorcion wears a thigh-revealing military cloak). **her smiling beauty's allure etc.:** a subtly enigmatic phrase; the girl's allure (*erôs*) was 'stamped' on her just as *erôs* 'rests in a young girls' soft cheeks' (Soph. *Ant.* 781–84) or 'the light of love glows on [a boy's] crimson cheeks' (Phrynichus **F 13** in Vol. 1). At the same time this *erôs* **sealed her off, secluded from hopes**, i.e. forbade sexual contact with her (the divine Eros is 'keyholder of Aphrodite's chambers', Eur. *Hipp.* 538–40). Thus her virginal sleep made her both alluring and inaccessible. **[ἐξεπεσφραγίζετο** with double prefix is unique here. I take **ἐξ-** in conjunction with **χωρὶς ἐλπίδων** (**sealed her <u>off</u> etc.**). Others see it as intensive ('marked her deeply'), and some explain the phrase as referring to an *erôs* felt by the girl (she

is lovelorn, Dolfi 46f., 52, or carefree in love, Carrara 199–202 taking **χωρὶς ἐλπίδων** as 'without forebodings'), but the speaker is surely describing the impression made on the viewer by the sleeping girl, not speculating about her emotional condition.**]**

12. [sleep-struck: ὑπνωμέναι is a perfect participle. Collard prefers the present-tense ὑπνούμεναι, 'as they fell asleep'.**]**

14–15. smudged a sun-bright shadow-image: 'The crushed saffron rubbed off onto the linen impressions of its flowers which were blurred (**σκιᾶς εἴδωλον**) but still brightly coloured (**ἠλιῶδες**)' (Collard 47 comparing Aesch. *Ag.* 839 and Soph. F 659.6 for σκιά used similarly: cf. also Pl. *Rep.* 532c2 εἰδώλων σκιάς 'shadows of images'.).

[16]–17. Verse 16 disrupts the description of the sleeping girls and must be deleted: cf. recently Collard 48, 55, Xanthakis-Karamanos 77. **[**The verse can only be retained if one reads μαλακοὺς ἐξέτεινεν in line 17 (Scaliger, Wilamowitz followed by *TrGF* and *MusTr*) or μαλακοῖς ἐξέτεινεν (Dolfi 47f.):[28] lines 16f. would then read, 'and the flourishing marjoram, nurtured by dew, extended its soft necks on the meadow (*or* its necks on the soft meadow)'. But the change of focus is abrupt and the physical detail in line 17 is much more appropriate for the girls whose bodies are so meticulously described in the rest of the fragment. Collard suggested that line 16 came from another example of Chaeremon's flower-descriptions supplied by Athenaeus. West (1983a, 80) suggested a lacuna between 16 and 17 ('The dew-fed marjoram also ⟨*cushioned their lovely bodies, as in slumber*⟩ on the soft meadow they stretched out their necks'); but without line 16 we have an elegant sentence which is better not disrupted.**]**

F 15

The fragment recalls Tiresias's description of the blessings of wine in Eur. *Bacchae* 280–85 and may come from *Dionysus* as Welcker suggested (1841, 1093). He linked **F 16** with **F 15**, and Snell prints the two fragments together (without attributing them to *Dionysus*) as if both come from the same speech. But see the next note.

F 16

Linked with **F 15** by Welcker, Snell and others, but Theophrastus is quoted as saying that **F 16** comes from a description of the effects of Eros, so there is no reason to link it with **F 15** or to assign it to *Dionysus* (τοῖς χρωμένοις in the preamble to **F 15** resembles τῶν χρωμένων in **F 16**, but that may be a coincdence). The gist of **F 16(a)** is attributed to the comic Plato (fr. dub. 295 *PCG*), and a

[28] μαλακοῖς should be retained in any case. The phrase recalls the verdant λειμῶνες μαλακοί of *Odyssey* 5.72, 9.132f., and singular λειμῶνι μαλακῷ etc. in Hes. *Theog.* 279, *Hom.Hymn* 2.7, 3.118, 4.198, 19.25 (Collard 47f., Dolfi 48).

similar comparison with *philia* to both Demosthenes (fr. 13§27 Baiter–Sauppe) and Aristotle (Stobaeus 2.33.12). The attributions are all questionable, and the idea may in any case have been proverbial.

F 17

From Athenaeus's discussion of water (2.40f–46e). Eubulus's speaker probably quoted the couplet and named Chaeremon as its source in an imitation of a tragic report-speech. Similarly quoted in comedies are Chaeremon **F 42** and Carcinus **F 5a** (both from Menander's *Shield*), Agathon **F 15** (Aristophanes fr. 592.35 *PCG*), and others from Sophocles and Euripides cited by Kassel–Austin on Eubulus fr. 128 *PCG* (cf. Hunter on his fr. 151). **a river's body** is a riddling phrase like the 'kennings' of Choerilus **F 2–3** (Vol. 1) but accompanied by its definition. Stephanopoulos (1984, 188) compares Gorgias B 11a.30 DK 'laws, guardians of the just; writing, memory's tool etc.'; also (1988, 12) Empedocles B 55 DK 'sea, earth's sweat'. See also Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 494f., 'mud's sister, thirsty dust', for Aeschylus's usage ('first comes the γρῖφος, then its solution'). For the body metaphor cf. Empedocles B 100.11 'water's tender body' and others in Collard 2007, 49 n. 20.

F 18

Poverty compels people to do things they would not otherwise choose to do: cf. Theognis 383–92, 649–52, Eur. *El.* 375f., F 915, Ar. *Wealth* 532–4. For the personification cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1004 (disease is health's neighbour), 1434 ('my expectation does not tread the halls of fear'), Eur. *HF* 557 (Lycus dwells far from the goddess *Aidôs*).

F 19

For the thought see above on **F 2**.

F 20–22

All from Stobaeus's chapter 'On the nature of time' and discussed by Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 135f. For **F 20 τὸ πᾶν**, **all the same** see LSJ 'πᾶς' D III.1a. In **F 21** the point is that one should never abandon a search for truth: cf. Soph. *OT* 110f., *TrGF* adesp. F 526, others in Pearson on Sophocles F 843, Arnott on Alexis fr. 31 *PCG*. For time 'softening' emotions (**F 22**, μαλάσσει) cf. Eur. *Alc.* 381, 1085, *Or.* 1201, and for time subduing anger Critias **F 22?** and Theodectas **F 9** with notes.

F 23–26

All from Stobaeus's chapters 'On intelligence' (*phronêsis*) and 'On foolishness' (*aphrosynê*). **F 23** probably means that a wise man considers all courses of action and then chooses the best one (see next note). It need not refer to the

philosophical virtue of *phronêsis* as Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 138 and Mueller-Goldingen 2005, 89f. suggest. **F 24**, on the other hand, may allude to the Socratic belief that an unexamined life, or a life without philosophy, is not worth living (Pl. *Apol.* 29–30, 38a5, cf. Mueller-Goldingen 94). **F 26** appeals to the proverbial truth that people attribute success/good fortune to intelligence (*sophia*) and (conversely) failure/ill fortune to foolishness, cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 700f., F 1017, Solon fr. 13.69f., Pind. *Ol.* 2.51f. and others discussed by Slater 2001. Presumably the speaker is trying to excuse a failure like the Nurse in *Hipp.* 700f.

F 23

One should value the best course etc.: τὸ κράτιστον (or κράτιστα) often denotes the best opinion or course of action (e.g. Eur. *Med.* 384, *Hipp.* 401, Soph. *Phil.* 1176, Thuc. 1.36, 1.85, Pl. *Phdr*. 228c6: LSJ 'κράτιστος' 3). **συλλαβὼν ἔχει**: periphrastic perfect (LSJ 'ἔχω' B IV), e.g. Eur. F 862 ἐν ⟨αὐτὸς⟩ αὑτῷ πάντα συλλαβὼν ἔχει ('(the year) comprehends everything in itself'), Aeschines 1.15 ὃς ἑνὶ κεφαλαίῳ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα συλλαβὼν ἔχει ('who comprises all such evils under a single heading'). For the sense of the whole cf. Soph. *Aj*. 1252 ἀλλ' οἱ φρονοῦντες εὖ κρατοῦσι πανταχοῦ, 'but men of good sense always prevail', which supports Hense's view that the two verses make a single couplet.

[The couplet is ascribed to Chaeremon in Trincavelli's edition of Stobaeus where it is preceded by a single verse with no ascription, οὐχ ὡς νομίζεις, τὸ φρονεῖν εἶπας κακῶς ('(It's) not as you think, you've spoken ill of intelligence'); this is now *TrGF* adesp. F 518. Mss. MA of Stobaeus have only **F 23**.2, ascribed to Chaeremon. This led to some confusion amongst editors before Hense (see his apparatus): Nauck, for example, made **F 23** a single verse (ὁ γὰρ φρονῶν εὖ etc.) and printed the other two as adesp. F 518, although in his apparatus he favoured Gaisford's suggestion that the three verses are really three separate fragments. Nauck's **F 40** is a paraphrase of **F 23**.2 in a rhetorical exercise by the Byzantine author George Pachymeres.**]**

F 28–29

Both from Stob. 3.20 'On anger', like Eur. F 31, F 259, adesp. F 523 etc. Anger detrimental to good judgment: Eur. *Med.* 1080 with Mastronarde's note.

F 30

The higher power (τὸ κρεῖσσον): i.e. the divine, the gods, cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 60, Eur. *Andr.* 1007f., Hdt. 7.10ε etc.; Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 144; Stephanopoulos 1988b, 12f. and 1990, 37. For **ὅλως, absolutely** see on Dionysius **[F 7]**.

F 32

One of many such comments in Stobaeus 4.22b under the heading 'That marriage is not good'. Hipponax fr. 68 *IEG* and Eur. fr. dub. 1112 are similar, and the

theme is predictably common in comedy. Meineke re-ascribed this fragment to Philemon, unnecessarily: »» Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 150.

F 33

See notes on Agathon **F 28**, Dicaeogenes **F 4–5**.

F 35

Mildness of fathers towards sons (mostly from Stobaeus): Euripides F 339, 950–51, Menander frs 829–832 *PCG.*

F 36

Using or displaying wealth in pursuit of public office is degrading, but enjoying it privately is welcome and not unattractive. The relative merits and demerits of wealth and poverty are endlessly debated in texts from democratic Athens, where for obvious reasons wealth was generally treated with suspicion. This statement strikes a balance, approving wealth so long as it is not exploited for public advancement. Stobaeus's text is corrupt at several points, including the crucial terms in lines 1 and 3, but the general sense is clear enough.

1. the *†whole†* offices: Meineke's πόλεως ('the city's offices') is at least on the right lines. Stephanopoulos (1988, 13) compares Democritus B 254 DK, οἱ κακοὶ ἰόντες εἰς τὰς τιμάς, 'base men coming into (public) offices'. **2. eminence . . . prestige:** Headlam (1904, 430) compared Alexis fr. 265.6 *PCG* δόξης . . . ὄγκον, 'eminence of repute'. Similarly Eur. *El.* 381 δοκήσει δωμάτων ὠγκωμένος, 'swollen with family reputation', [Eur.] *Rhes.* 760 ὄγκος καὶ δόμων εὐδοξία, 'eminence and good family repute', Plut. *Nicias* 15.2 'Nicias's eminence (ὄγκος) was great for various reasons and especially because of his wealth and his good repute (δόξαν)'. **3. ἄσεμνος, without dignity:** Stobaeus's text gives 'is dignified', the opposite of the sense needed. **in men's houses:** Stobaeus's text is unmetrical and almost meaningless. Stephanopoulos (above) compares Eur. F 22.4f. ᾧ δ' ἂν ἐν δόμοις χρόνον συνοικῇ πλεῖστον, 'In whomever's house it (i.e. wealth) dwells longest', Critias **F 25** 'It's better to have wealthy ignorance than wise poverty as a companion (σύνοικον) in your house' (which favours **σύνοικος** here in line 4). Note also Plato, *Laws* 679b 'The kind of cohabitation (συνοικίᾳ) that neither wealth nor poverty shares in (συνοικῇ) is, I suppose, the kind that fosters the noblest characters (γενναιότατα ἤθη)'. **endowed with a certain charm:** i.e. attractive to others as well as pleasant for the possessor.

F 38

bad at serving: i.e. incapable of acting on their anger. The helplessness of old men is often dramatized in both tragedy and comedy.

F 39

veins . . . root-wandering: palm trees have multiple tentacle-like roots, densely massed and often visible above ground.

F 41?

From a brief Byzantine rhetorical treatise illustrating thirty poetic devices, here the *ainigma* or 'riddle' (cf. on Agathon **F 4** in Vol. 1). Snell obelized the whole fragment and queried the attribution to Chaeremon, but with a minor alteration suggested by Schneidewin (1848, 125) it makes tolerable sense: the vine buds in spring, produces fruit when it has been ripened by the summer's heat, and sheds her leaves and becomes dormant in winter. This may be from a satyr-play rather than a tragedy, perhaps the polymetric *Centaur* (the metre is trochaic tetrameter). Walker 1923, 163 assigned it to *Dionysus* (a satyr-play in his opinion).

[later with summer's aid: Schneidewin altered the Greek to τοῦ θέρους ἐς ὕστερον ('subsequently to the summer'), but this makes awkward phrasing and ἐς ὕστερον with genitive is unparalleled. **ἐς** is probably right, however, cf. Hom. *Od.* 12.26, Hes. *Op.* 351, Soph. *Ant.* 1194 (εἰς ὕστερον is transmitted in Eur. *IA* 720 (corr. Triclinius), otherwise only in prose). **οἴχεται, is dead:** »» LSJ 'οἴχομαι' II.1. **ἐν χειμῶνι** is unmetrical but perhaps tolerable in this peculiar context. Schneidewin's ἐν δὲ χειμῶν' makes an abnormal elision. John Gibert (*per litt.*) suggests reading χείματος δ' ἀποίχεται, comparing *Odyssey* 7.117f. οὔποτε καρπὸς ἀπόλλυται οὐδ' ἀπολείπει | χείματος οὐδὲ θέρευς.**]**

F 42

Another tragic quotation from Act 3 of Menander's *Shield*: see on Carcinus **F 5a.**

THEODECTAS
(*TrGF* 72)

Texts etc. *TrGF* 1[2].227–37 with *addenda* 1[2].354, 5.1112, 1116; *MusTr* 169–79, 291f.; Pacelli 2016.

Discussions. Del Grande 1933–34; Hoffmann 1951, 184–94; Webster 1954, 302–4; *New Pauly* 'Theodectes' (M. Weissenberger); Mueller-Goldingen 2005, 67–75; Matelli 2007; Wright 2016a, 163–75; Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 54–58; *SEHT* II.771f. See also below under *Lynceus* and *Mausolus*.

*Literary sources use the Attic form Theodectes, but the name is properly Theodectas as in the Victors List inscription (DID A 3a.45 = T 3); he came from the Dorian settlement of Phaselis on the Lycian/Pamphylian coast 120 km. south of modern Antalya. The Suda (**T 1**) and Stephanus of Byzantium (**T 2**) provide brief biographical surveys, with some confusion in the Suda's entry. The Victors Lists inscription records seven victories at the City Dionysia, of which the first came after the first victory of Astydamas II in 372, thus between 371 and say 367. If he turned to tragedy only after making his living as a rhetor for some years (**T 1**, **T 7**, **T 8**), this will have been when he was at least thirty years old, putting his birth not later than 397. If he competed thirteen times and won eight victories in the city festivals (**T 2**) and competed in the funeral celebrations for Mausolus in 352, he cannot have died aged 41; nor was he a pupil of Aristotle, who was at least ten years younger and only arrived at Athens in 367, although he probably knew him well. These contradictions are resolved if we suppose that the Suda's sentence about his death has been misplaced and actually belongs in the entry for his son (*θ 139, printed with **T 1** below); the addition 'while his father was still living' then explained that the younger Theodectas died first. It follows that we do not know when the tragedian died, except that it was after his son's death. Plutarch's story that Alexander the Great, passing through Phaselis in the winter of 334/3, garlanded a statue of Theodectas and thus 'paid a not ungracious tribute to his association with the man which had come about through Aristotle and philosophy' will refer to the son if it is true (but see **T 4** with note). The younger Theodectas may nevertheless have been born in the mid-370s and died in the mid-330s, and his father may have died not much later. »» Radermacher 1939, Weissenberger (*New Pauly*), Matelli 2007, Pacelli 2016, 55–59.*

Much of our biographical information on Theodectas seems to have come from a work of Hermippus of Smyrna (3rd C. BC) On the Students of Isocrates *which is cited by Athenaeus (**T 10**). His studies with Isocrates are mentioned in other sources (**T 1**, **T 6**, **T 7**). That he also studied with Plato is attested only by the Suda; there is no reason why he should not have attended both schools, but his careers in rhetoric and tragic poetry suggest that he was not much influenced by Plato's teaching. He was active as a practitioner and teacher of rhetoric both before and after launching his dramatic career, and became prominent enough to deliver one of the funeral orations for Mausolus of Caria in 352 (**T 1**, **T 6**: p. 144 below). Aristotle in his* Rhetoric *quotes arguments from two of his published works,*[1] *and other sources refer to an* Art of Rhetoric[2] *which Aristotle summarized and drew upon for his own work. It was apparently through Aristotle's summary that some elements of Theodectas's* Art *were generally known to later writers on rhetoric such as Cicero, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Quintilian.*[3]

The production numbers mentioned above may imply twelve productions with seven prizes at the Dionysia and a single prize-winning one at the Lenaea.[4] *The eight tragedies whose titles we have (*Ajax*,*

---

[1] *Nomos* (*Law)*, *Rhet.* 1398b5–9, 1399b1–4; *Socrates* (a defence), *Rhet.* 1399a7–9.

[2] τὴν Θεοδέκτου τέχνην, Antiphanes fr. 111.4 *PCG* (= Theodectas T 9 *TrGF*, a contemporary reference); Θεοδέκτου τέχνης τέσσαρα (Rhodian library-list inscription, Maiuri 1925 no. 11, 2nd C. BC); cf. **T 1** and **T 2** with notes, Radermacher 1951 no. 37.

[3] Aristotle summarized or excerpted many of his predecessors' treatises on rhetoric in a *Digest of Arts (Τέχνων συναγωγή)*: see frs 136–141 Rose, especially Cicero's remarks in *De Inventione* 2.6 and *De Oratore* 2.160 (Aristot. fr. 136). We also hear specifically of a *Digest of Theodectes' Art* (*Τέχνης Θεοδέκτου συναγωγή*, Diogenes Laertius 5.24, [Hesychius], *Life of Aristotle*: frs 124–135 Rose) which is probably the *Theodectea* mentioned by Aristotle himself at *Rhet.* 1410b2. Later writers ascribe its contents to Theodectas and/or Aristotle. For analysis of the sources see Matelli 2007.

[4] This assumes that each Dionysia production comprised three tragedies and a satyr-play, but the Didascaliae inscription shows that the arrangements for satyr-plays had changed by 341 (above, p. 93 n. 6) and that in 340 the poets competed with two tragedies each. Nothing is known about the Dionysia programme earlier in the fourth century (i.e. for most of Theodectas's career), except that an 'old tragedy' was added in 386 (the Victors Lists inscription, DID A 1).

Alcmeon, Helen(?), Lynceus, Oedipus, Orestes, Tydeus, Philoctetes*) are discussed individually below along with* Mausolus *which was produced at Halicarnassus.*

Aristotle is largely responsible for our knowing anything about seven of the plays named above. What we learn from him is determined by his reasons for referring to them: elements of plot-design in the Poetics *(*Lynceus, Tydeus*), rhetorical distinctions in the* Rhetoric *(*Ajax, Alcmeon, Orestes*), moral and socio-political points in the* Nicomachean Ethics *(*Philoctetes*) and* Politics *(*Helen(?)*). His brief and allusive references usually give us some sense of what each play was about and what*

T 1 Suda *θ* 138

Θεοδέκτης, Ἀριστάνδρου, Φασηλίτης ἐκ Λυκίας, ῥήτωρ, τραπεὶς δὲ ἐπὶ τραγῳδίας, μαθητὴς Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἰσοκράτους καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους. οὗτος καὶ ὁ Ἐρυθραῖος Ναυκράτης καὶ Ἰσοκράτης ὁ ῥήτωρ, ὁ Ἀπολλωνιάτης, καὶ Θεόπομπος, ἐπὶ τῆς ργ΄ ὀλυμπιάδος εἶπον ἐπιτάφιον ἐπὶ Μαυσώλῳ, Ἀρτεμισίας τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ προτρεψαμένης. καὶ ἐνίκησε μάλιστα εὐδοκιμήσας ἐν ᾗ εἶπε τραγῳδίᾳ. ἄλλοι δέ φασι Θεόπομπον ἔχειν τὰ πρωτεῖα. δράματα δὲ ἐδίδαξε ν΄. {τελευτᾷ δὲ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐτῶν ἑνὸς καὶ μ΄, ἔτι τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ περιόντος.} ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ τέχνην ῥητορικὴν ἐν μέτρῳ, καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ καταλογάδην.

— Suda *θ* 139: Θεοδέκτης, Φασηλίτης, ῥήτωρ, υἱὸς τοῦ προτέρου. ἔγραψεν ἐγκώμιον Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Ἠπειρώτου, ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα, Νόμιμα βαρβαρικά, Τέχνην ῥητορικὴν ἐν βιβλίοις ζ΄, καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ὑπομνήματα. ⟨τελευτᾷ δὲ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐτῶν ἑνὸς καὶ μ΄, ἔτι τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ περιόντος.⟩

T 2 Stephanus of Byzantium φ 40 Billerbeck–Neumann-Hartmann

Φάσηλις, πόλις Παμφυλίας . . . Θεοδέκτης δ’ ἦν γένος Φασηλίτης, υἱὸς Ἀριστάνδρου, κάλλει διαφέρων, ὃς ἐποίησε τραγῳδίας ν΄ καὶ ῥητορικὰς τέχνας καὶ λόγους ῥητορικοὺς ἐπῶν †καί†. ἀπέθανε δ’ Ἀθήνησι, καὶ ἐπιγέγραπται αὐτῷ ἐλεγεῖον τόδε·

Ἥδε χθὼν κόλποισι Φασηλίτην Θεοδέκτην
κρύπτει, ὃν ηὔξησαν Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες.
ἐν δὲ χορῶν ⟨τραγικῶν⟩ ἱεραῖς τρισὶ καὶ δέχ’ ἀμίλλαις
ὀκτὼ ἀγηράτους ἀμφεθέμην στεφάνους.

epigram: see **T 2** n. 3 ἐν δὲ χορῶν ⟨τραγικῶν⟩ etc. Tyrwhitt ἐν δὲ χθὼν ἱεραῖς τρισκαίδεκα (*or* τρεῖς καὶ δέκα) Steph. 4 ἀγηράτους Preger (-άντους Ruhnken) ἀκηράτους Steph.

*was happening in the scene to which he refers, but offer little insight into larger matters such as the play's structure, its treatment of the relevant myth, responses to earlier treatments of the same theme or contemporary relevance. Other text-fragments are no more informative: Athenaeus's riddles (**F 4** from* Oedipus*, **F 6**, **F 18**, cf. **T 10**), sententious verses quoted by Eusebius from* Alcmeon *(**F 1a**) and Stobaeus from unnamed plays (**F 7–16**: **F 9** and **F 10** offer some indications of context) and Strabo quoting a description of the Ethiopians (**F 17**). In all, we get some sense of Theodectas's proficiency in creating rhetorical and melodramatic scenes but a very limited picture of his qualities as a poet and dramatist.*

T 1 Suda

Theodectes, son of Aristandros, from Phaselis in Lycia, a rhetor but turned to tragedies, pupil of Plato and Isocrates and Aristotle. He and Naucrates of Erythrae and the rhetor Isocrates of Apollonia and Theopompus, in the 106th Olympiad (356/5–353/2 BC), each spoke a funeral address for Mausolus at the direction of his wife Artemisia. And he won the prize, achieving great distinction with the tragedy that he spoke. Others however say that Theopompus came first. He produced 50 plays. {And he died in Athens aged forty-one while his father was still living.} He also wrote a rhetorical textbook in verse, and other things in prose.

— Suda, next entry: Theodectes, citizen of Phaselis, rhetor, son of the above. He wrote an encomium of Alexander of Epirus, historical works, *Barbarian Customs*, an *Art of Rhetoric* in 7 books, and many other works. ⟨And he died in Athens aged forty-one while his father was still living.⟩

T 2 Stephanus of Byzantium, *Ethnica*

Phaselis, a city in Pamphylia . . . Theodectes was a citizen of Phaselis by birth, son of Aristandros, a very handsome man, who composed 50 tragedies and rhetorical textbooks and rhetorical speeches numbering . . . *(number corrupted)* . . . lines. He died at Athens, and the following elegy is inscribed for him:[5]

> This land hides in its bosom Theodectes of Phaselis, who was exalted by the Muses of Olympus. In thirteen sacred contests of tragic choruses I donned eight unageing crowns.

[5] The two couplets probably do not belong together: see note below on **T 2**.

T 4 Plutarch, *Alexander* 17.8–9

αὐτὸς δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς ὁδοποιῆσαί φησι τὴν λεγομένην Κλίμακα καὶ διελθεῖν ὁρμήσας ἐκ Φασηλίδος. διὸ καὶ πλείονας ἡμέρας ἐν τῇ πόλει διέτριψεν ἐν αἷς καὶ Θεοδέκτου τεθνηκότος — ἦν δὲ Φασηλίτης — ἰδὼν εἰκόνα κειμένην ἐν ἀγορᾷ, μετὰ δεῖπνον ἐπεκώμασε μεθύων καὶ τῶν στεφάνων ἐπέρριψε πολλούς, οὐκ ἄχαριν ἐν παιδιᾷ ἀποδιδοὺς τιμὴν τῇ γενομένῃ δι᾽ Ἀριστοτέλην καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ὁμιλίᾳ πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα.

T 6 Aulus Gellius 10.18.5–7

Id monumentum Artemisia cum dis manibus sacris Mausoli dicaret, agona, id est certamen laudibus eius dicundis, facit ponitque praemia pecuniae aliarumque rerum bonarum amplissima. (6) Ad eas laudes decertandas venisse dicuntur viri nobiles ingenio atque lingua praestabili, Theopompus, Theodectes, Naucrates; sunt etiam qui Isocratem ipsum cum his certavisse memoriae mandaverint. Sed eo certamine vicisse Theopompum iudicatum est. Is fuit Isocratis discipulus. (7) Exstat nunc quoque Theodecti tragoedia, quae inscribitur Mausolus*; in qua eum magis quam in prosa placuisse Hyginus in* Exemplis (fr. 12 Funaioli) *refert.*

T 7 [Plutarch], *Moralia* 837c

ἐμαθήτευσε δ᾽ αὐτῷ (sc. Ἰσοκράτει) καὶ Θεόπομπος ὁ Χῖος καὶ Ἔφορος ὁ Κυμαῖος καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης ὁ τὰ τραγῳδούμενα συγγράψας καὶ Θεοδέκτης ὁ Φασηλίτης ὁ τὰς τραγῳδίας ὕστερον γράψας . . . *(continued in* ***T 15*****) . . .**

T 8 Theopompus F 25.1–4 *FGrH* (Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 176, p. 120b30–36 Bekker)

συνακμάσαι δὲ λέγει αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν Ἰσοκράτει τε τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ καὶ Θεοδέκτῃ τῷ Φασηλίτῃ καὶ Ναυκράτει τῷ Ἐρυθραίῳ, καὶ τούτους ἅμα αὐτῷ τὰ πρωτεῖα τῆς ἐν λόγοις παιδείας ἔχειν ἐν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν· ἀλλὰ Ἰσοκράτην μὲν δι᾽ ἀπορίαν βίου καὶ Θεοδέκτην μισθοῦ λόγους γράφειν καὶ σοφιστεύειν, ἐκπαιδεύοντας τοὺς νέους κἀκεῖθεν καρπουμένους τὰς ὠφελείας . . .

T 10 Athenaeus 10.451e–f

Θεοδέκτην δὲ τὸν Φασηλίτην φησὶν Ἕρμιππος ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν Ἰσοκράτους μαθητῶν ἱκανώτατον γεγονέναι ἀνευρεῖν τὸν προβληθέντα γρῖφον καὶ αὐτὸν προβαλεῖν ἑτέροις ἐπιδεξίως, οἷον τὸν περὶ τῆς σκιᾶς . . . *(see* ***F 18****)* . . . κἀν τῷ Οἰδίποδι δὲ τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ . . . *(see* ***F 4****)* . . .

T 4 Plutarch, *Life of Alexander*

Alexander himself . . . in his letters . . . says that he went by way of the so-called Ladder and traversed it after setting out from Phaselis. He therefore spent several days in that city. During that time he saw a statue of Theodectas, who was from Phaselis, standing in the agora, and after dining went on a drunken revel and threw many of the revellers' garlands on the statue. Thus he paid in play a not ungracious tribute to his association with the man which had come about through Aristotle and philosophy.

T 6 Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights*

When Artemisia was dedicating this monument to the sacred shades of Mausolus (i.e. the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus), she organized an *agôn*, i.e. a contest in proclaiming his praises, and offered very substantial prizes of money and other good things. To participate in this competition noble men of outstanding talent and rhetorical ability are said to have come: Theopompus, Theodectes, Naucrates; some have also recorded that Isocrates himself competed with them. But in this contest it was judged that Theopompus had won. He was a pupil of Isocrates. There survives even now a tragedy of Theodectes, entitled *Mausolus*; Hyginus in his *Examples* reports that he gave more pleasure in this than in prose.

T 7 [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators*

His (i.e. Isocrates') pupils also included Theopompus of Chios, Ephorus of Cyme, Asclepiades who wrote the *Tales from Tragedy* and Theodectes of Phaselis who later wrote tragedies . . . *(continued in* ***T 15****)* . . . .

T 8 Theopompus (summarized in Photius's *Library*)

He himself (i.e. Theopompus) says that he was of similar age to Isocrates of Athens and Theodectes of Phaselis and Naucrates of Erythrae, and that these along with him were in the first rank in literary accomplishment amongst the Hellenes; but Isocrates and Theodectes for want of a living wrote speeches and gave lectures for payment, educating the young and earning their income from that.

T 10 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*

Hermippus in his *On the pupils of Isocrates* says that Theodectes of Phaselis was very good at solving a riddle that had been posed and himself posing one ingeniously for others, such as the one about the shadow . . . *(see* ***F 18****)* . . . and in the tragedy *Oedipus* . . . *(see* ***F 4****)* . . . .

T 15

(a) [Plutarch], *Moralia* 837c (continuing **T 7**)

(καὶ Θεοδέκτης ὁ Φασηλίτης . . .) οὗ ἐστι τὸ μνῆμα ἐπὶ τὴν Κυαμῖτιν πορευομένοις κατὰ τὴν ἱερὰν ὁδὸν τὴν ἐπ᾽ Ἐλευσῖνα, τὰ νῦν κατερηρειμμένον· ἔνθα καὶ τοὺς ἐνδόξους τῶν ποιητῶν ἀνέστησαν σὺν αὐτῷ, ὧν Ὅμηρος ὁ ποιητὴς σῴζεται μόνος.

(b) Pausanias 1.37.4

διαβᾶσι δὲ τὸν Κηφισὸν βωμός ἐστιν ἀρχαῖος Μειλιχίου Διός . . . τάφος δὲ ἔστι μὲν αὐτόθι Θεοδέκτου τοῦ Φασηλίτου . . . ᾠκοδόμηται δὲ κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ναὸς οὐ μέγας καλούμενος Κυαμίτου . . .

ΑΙΑΣ

Pacelli 2016, 70–73.

The play included Ajax's contest with Odysseus for the award of Achilles' arms and probably continued with his madness and suicide (see ***F 1*** *with note).* TrGF *adesp. F 110, five verses in which Ajax complains of his disgrace and feels the stirring of madness, could be from this play (Welcker 1841, 1073) but is more often assigned to Aeschylus's* Thracian Women*.*

F 1 Aristotle, *Rhetoric* **(a)** 1399b19–29 and **(b)** 1400a22–29

(a) ἄλλος τὸ οὗ ἕνεκ᾽ ἂν εἴη ἢ γένοιτο, τούτου ἕνεκα φάναι εἶναι ἢ γεγενῆσθαι, οἷον . . . καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Αἴαντος τοῦ Θεοδέκτου, ὅτι ὁ Διομήδης προείλετο Ὀδυσσέα οὐ τιμῶν, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα ἥττων ᾖ ὁ ἀκολουθῶν.

(b) ἄλλος τοῖς προδιαβεβλημένοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις καὶ πράγμασιν, ἢ δοκοῦσι, τὸ λέγειν τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ παραδόξου· ἔστι γάρ τι δι᾽ ὃ φαίνεται· οἷον . . . καὶ οἷον ἐν τῷ Αἴαντι τῷ Θεοδέκτου Ὀδυσσεὺς λέγει πρὸς τὸν Αἴαντα διότι ἀνδρειότερος ὢν τοῦ Αἴαντος οὐ δοκεῖ.

ΑΛΚΜΕΩΝ

Pacelli 2016, 74–88

Many tragedies treated the stories of Alcmeon and Alphesiboea (see on Astydamas's Alcmeon*, pp. 28–31 above and Achaeus's* Alphesiboea*, Vol. 1, p. 108). In brief, Alcmeon fled from Argos after killing his mother Eriphyle, who had been bribed by Polynices with the necklace of Harmonia to send her husband Amphiaraus to his death with the Seven*

T 15

(a) [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* (continuing **T 7**)

(and Theodectes of Phaselis . . .) whose memorial is near the Kuamitis ('Bean-market') as you travel along the Sacred Way towards Eleusis, now ruined. There with him they also set up statues of the celebrated poets, of whom only Homer is now preserved.

(b) Pausanias, *Description of Greece*

After you have crossed the Cephisus there is an ancient altar of Zeus Meilichios . . . and in the same place there is a tomb of Theodectes of Phaselis . . . and by the road is built a little shrine called the shrine of Kuamites ('Bean-hero') . . .

AJAX

F 1 Aristotle, *Rhetoric*

(a) Another (type of argument) is to assert that what might be a reason for something being the case or happening actually is the reason for its being the case or having happened, for example . . . *(*TrGF *adesp. F 82 and Antiphon* ***F 2*** *quoted)* . . . and the one from Theodectas's *Ajax*, that Diomedes preferred Odysseus not because he respected him but so that his companion would be inferior to himself.

(b) Another (type of argument), for both people and facts that have previously been disparaged or seem to have been, (is) to state the reason for the inconsistency, i.e. that there is something that makes it seem so. For example . . . *(an anecdotal example)* . . . , and in Theodectes' *Ajax* Odysseus says to Ajax that he is actually braver than Ajax although he does not seem so.

ALCMEON

against Thebes. Alcmeon was purified from the matricide by king Phegeus at Psophis in northwest Arcadia, and there married Alphesiboea, the king's daughter, giving her the necklace as a wedding gift. He later obtained further purification from the river-god Achelous in northwestern Greece and took the god's daughter Callirhoe as a second wife, but returned to Psophis to retrieve the necklace for her and was

*killed by Alphesiboea's brothers as he stole it away. All that we know of Theodectas's play is that it included a complaint about the wretched lot of women (**F 1a**) and a scene in which Alphesiboea questioned Alcmeon about his matricide (**F 2**). **F 1a** may have been the play's opening lines, and the reminiscence of Medea's complaint (Eur.* Med. *231) suggests that this too was a woman's complaint about her own misery, like also Deianeira's at the beginning of Sophocles'* Trachiniae *and Procne's near the beginning of Sophocles'* Tereus *(F 583).*[6] *If so, the speaker was probably Alphesiboea, and one might think that like Deianeira she was complaining about being deserted by her husband after his departure*

F 1a Eusebius, *Praep. Evangel.* 10.3.19 quoting Porphyry, *Lecture on Literature* fr. 3

τοῦ δὲ Εὐριπίδου εἰπόντος *γυναῖκές ἐσμεν ἀθλιώτατον φυτόν*, Θεοδέκτης ἐν *Ἀλκμαίωνί* φησι·

σαφὴς μὲν ἐν βροτοῖσιν ὑμνεῖται λόγος,
ὡς οὐδέν ἐστιν ἀθλιώτερον φυτὸν
γυναικός.

οὗτος οὐ μόνον τὴν ἐπιβολὴν ἐκεῖθεν εἴληφεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς λέξεσιν αὐταῖς συγκέχρηται· καὶ ἠθέλησεν αὐτὸ πανούργως παροιμιακὸν μᾶλλον εἶναι καὶ ὡς ὑπὸ πολλῶν λεγομένῳ συγκεχρῆσθαι ἢ δοκεῖν εἰληφέναι παρὰ τοῦ γεγεννηκότος.

F 2 Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1397a23–b6 (paraphrased without the quotation in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *First Letter to Ammaeus*, § 12)

ἄλλος ἐκ τῶν πρὸς ἄλληλα· εἰ γὰρ θατέρῳ ὑπάρχει τὸ καλῶς ἢ δικαίως ποιῆσαι, θατέρῳ τὸ πεπονθέναι . . . καὶ εἰ τῷ πεπονθότι τὸ καλῶς ἢ δικαίως ὑπάρχει, καὶ τῷ ποιήσαντι. ἔστι δ' ἐν τούτῳ παραλογίσασθαι· εἰ γὰρ δικαίως ἔπαθέν τι, {δικαως πέπονθεν} ἀλλ' ἴσως οὐχ ὑπὸ σοῦ· διὸ δεῖ σκοπεῖν χωρὶς εἰ ἄξιος ὁ παθὼν παθεῖν καὶ ὁ ποιήσας ποιῆσαι, εἶτα χρῆσθαι ὁποτέρως ἂν ἁρμόττῃ· ἐνίοτε γὰρ διαφωνεῖ τὸ τοιοῦτον καὶ οὐδὲν κωλύει, ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ Ἀλκμαίωνι τῷ Θεοδέκτου,

μητέρα δὲ τὴν σὴν οὔ τις ἐστύγει βροτῶν;

φησὶ δὲ ἀποκρινόμενος,

ἀλλὰ διαλαβόντα χρὴ σκοπεῖν.

ἐρομένης δὲ τῆς Ἀλφεσιβοίας πῶς, ὑπολαβών φησιν,

τὴν μὲν θανεῖν ἔκριναν, ἐμὲ δὲ μὴ κτανεῖν.

[6] Recently enlarged by P. Oxy. 82.5292 (»» Finglass 2016; 2020, 92–96).

from Psophis. In ***F 2*** *however she seems to be questioning Alcmeon on his first arrival at Psophis and before his purification there: if so, there is no obvious explanation of what misfortune she might have been lamenting in* ***F 1a****: perhaps simply the vulnerability of women who are subjected to marriages beyond their control. The play will then have included Alcmeon's purification and his marriage with Alphesiboea, but those events hardly amount to a complete tragic plot. It may have continued with his departure from Psophis and his return and death, as Euripides'* Alcmeon in Psophis *may also have done (»» Collard–Cropp 2008a, 80f.).*

There is no case for assigning TrGF *adesp. F 641 to this play (»» Xanthakis-Karamanos 1988, 414f.).*

F 1a Eusebius, *Preparation for the Gospel*

And when Euripides had said *We women are a most wretched creature*, Theodectes in *Alcmaeon* says:

> True is the saying that is always on men's lips, that there is no creature more wretched than a woman.

He has not just taken the thought from Euripides but has also used the very same words; and he nefariously claimed that it was proverbial and to have used it as something commonly said rather than seeming to have taken it from its originator.

F 2 Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1397a23–b6

Another (type of argument) is from reciprocity: if one party can claim to have acted well or justly, then the other must have suffered so . . . and if the sufferer has suffered well or justly, so too must the doer have acted. But such an argument may be fallacious; for if the sufferer suffered something justly, {he has suffered justly} yet perhaps he did not do so *at your hands*. So one must examine separately if the sufferer deserved to suffer and if the doer was right to do it, and then use the appropriate reasoning on each side, for sometimes such a case is ambivalent; this is quite possible, as in Theodectes' *Alcmeon*:

> Was there no one who abhorred your mother?

And he replies:

> (Yes), but one should distinguish and then consider.

And when Alphesiboea asks 'How?', he replies:

> They judged that she should have died, but that I should not have killed her.

ΕΛΕΝΗ(?)

Pacelli 2016, 89–104

The title is uncertain since Aristotle cites Helen as the speaker of ***F 3*** *without naming the play (he cites Theodectas's plays by name elsewhere). His comment suggests that in this instance Helen was denying that enslavement could impair her innate nobility inherited from two divine parents.*[7] *The context may have been the aftermath of the capture of Troy, as in Euripides'* Trojan Women *where Helen is counted as one*

F 3 Aristotle, *Politics* 1255a32–41

τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον καὶ περὶ εὐγενείας· αὐτοὺς μὲν γὰρ οὐ μόνον παρ' αὑτοῖς εὐγενεῖς ἀλλὰ πανταχοῦ νομίζουσιν, τοὺς δὲ βαρβάρους οἴκοι μόνον, ὡς ὅν τι τὸ μὲν ἁπλῶς εὐγενὲς καὶ ἐλεύθερον, τὸ δ' οὐχ ἁπλῶς, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ Θεοδέκτου Ἑλένη φησὶ,

θείων δ' ἀπ' ἀμφοῖν ἔκγονον ῥιζωμάτων
τίς ἂν προσειπεῖν ἀξιώσειεν λάτριν;

ὅταν δὲ τοῦτο λέγωσιν, οὐθενὶ ἀλλ' ἢ ἀρετῇ καὶ κακίᾳ διορίζουσι τὸ δοῦλον καὶ ἐλεύθερον, καὶ τοὺς εὐγενεῖς καὶ τοὺς δυσγενεῖς. ἀξιοῦσι γάρ, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀνθρώπου ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἐκ θηρίων γίνεσθαι θηρίον, οὕτω καὶ ἐξ ἀγαθῶν ἀγαθόν.

ΛΥΓΚΕΥΣ

Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 53–57; Pacelli 2016, 105–12; Karamanou 2019, 73–81.

Lynceus was one of the fifty sons of Aegyptus who came to Argos pursuing marriages with the fifty daughters of his brother Danaus. He alone was spared by his bride Hypermestra when her sisters killed all of his brothers on their wedding-night. The aftermath of this episode was the subject of Aeschylus's Danaids *(*Daughters of Danaus*, the third play of his Danaid trilogy which included the extant* Suppliant Women*) and probably of Phrynichus's* Danaids *(Vol. 1, p. 24). Almost nothing is known of the epic* Danais *(*GEF *pp. 34, 266ff.) and very little of the relev-*

[7] The tradition that Helen was the daugher of Zeus and the goddess Nemesis (Retribution) rather than Zeus and the mortal Leda was current in the archaic period: cf. *Cypria* F 10–11 *GEF* with Kannicht on Eur. *Helen* 16–22, West 2013b, 80f., Davies 2019, 76–83; *LIMC* IV.1, 'Helene', p. 498.

HELEN(?)

*of the Trojan captives facing slavery (*Tro. *869–72: »» Welcker 1841, 1074, Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 67f., Pacelli 89–91). Del Grande (1933–34, 196) preferred a setting during Helen's 'captivity' in Egypt, as in Euripides'* Helen *where she resists the advances of the local ruler Theoclymenus, but enslavement was not a factor in that scenario.*

***F 10** is not from this play (see note there).*

F 3 Aristotle, *Politics*

Similarly with regard to nobility: they (i.e. Hellenes) consider themselves noble not only amongst themselves but everywhere, but barbarians only at home, meaning that the one kind is absolutely noble and free, and the other not absolutely so — just as Theodectes' Helen says,

> When someone is the offshoot of two divine roots, who would think it proper to call them a servant?

When they say this, they distinguish slave and free, and noble and low-born, precisely in terms of virtue and baseness. For they assume that, just as a human's offspring is human and beasts' offspring a beast, so also the offspring of noble people is noble.

LYNCEUS

ant part of the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women *(frs 127–129 M–W = 75–77 Most) except that there as in later Argive tradition Lynceus, Hypermestra and their son Abas founded the royal line which later included Perseus and Heracles.*[8] *Danaus himself came to a bad end, variously described in mythographic sources which reflect a variety of Argive aetiological legends (how the epic poets and Aeschylus treated the matter is unknown):*[9] *either Aegyptus attacked Argos seeking vengeance for his sons, and Lynceus intervened and arranged a trial of Danaus which presumably led to his condemnation (Schol. Eur.* Orestes *871, 872); or Lynceus avenged his brothers, killing Danaus and the*

[8] Epic and tragic sources: Gantz 1993, 203, with 206 on Danaus and Lynceus.

[9] [Hesiod] fr. 129 M–W = 77 Most begins tantalizingly with what looks like a reference to the punishment of Danaus, followed by the marriage and descendants of Lynceus and Hypermestra.

murderous Danaids and seizing the royal power (Schol. Eur. Hecuba *886)*;[10] *or Danaus had Hypermestra tried for defying his instruction to kill Lynceus and allowing him to threaten his own power, but she was acquitted by an Argive court and this somehow led to Danaus's death and Lynceus's succession (details scattered in Pausanias's description of Argos, 2.16–25, cf. 10.10.5; in some sources Danaus had tried to prevent his daughters from marrying because he feared that a son born to one of them would overthrow him).*

Aristotle's testimony in the Poetics *is vague and the text is confused at one point, but it seems to imply a play in which the secretly born child Abas was discovered and seized, Lynceus and Hypermestra were put on trial for murder, Lynceus (at least) was condemned and taken away for execution under Danaus's supervision, and this somehow led to Danaus being killed and Lynceus saved (see note on* ***F 3a****). Such a plot does not coincide exactly with any of the traditions noted above, though it has some similarities to what we find in Pausanias, where however it is Hypermestra who was tried and acquitted (Paus. 2.19.6, 2.20.7, 2.21.2) and there is no mention of a trial and near-execution of Lynceus, nor of the violent death of Danaus. Theodectas seems to have used the legend-*

F 3a Aristotle, *Poetics* **(a)** 1452a22–29, **(b)** 1455b26–32

(a) ἔστι δὲ περιπέτεια μὲν ἡ εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον τῶν πραττομένων μεταβολὴ καθάπερ εἴρηται, καὶ τοῦτο δὲ ὥσπερ λέγομεν κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἢ ἀναγκαῖον, οἷον ἐν τῷ Οἰδίποδι . . . καὶ ἐν τῷ Λυγκεῖ ὁ μὲν ἀγόμενος ὡς ἀποθανούμενος, ὁ δὲ Δαναὸς ἀκολουθῶν ὡς ἀποκτενῶν, τὸν μὲν συνέβη ἐκ τῶν πεπραγμένων ἀποθανεῖν, τὸν δὲ σωθῆναι.

(b) λέγω δὲ δέσιν μὲν εἶναι τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι τούτου τοῦ μέρους ὃ ἔσχατόν ἐστιν ἐξ οὗ μεταβαίνει εἰς εὐτυχίαν ἢ εἰς ἀτυχίαν, λύσιν δὲ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς μεταβάσεως μέχρι τέλους· ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ Λυγκεῖ τῷ Θεοδέκτου δέσις μὲν τά

[10] Malalas 4.1 has Lynceus making war on Danaus and killing him, ascribing the story implausibly to Archilochus (fr. 35 *IEG*). According to Hyginus, *Fab.* 170 and 273.2 Lynceus on hearing from Abas of Danaus's death rewarded his son with a shield that Danaus had previously dedicated to Hera, thus providing the origin of the 'Shield' contest which was part of the great festival of Hera at Argos. Welcker (1841, 1076–78) thought this reflected the ending of Theodectas's play, but the child (παιδίον) mentioned by Aristotle hardly fits such a scenario (cf. Del Grande 1933/34, 197f.).

ary data eclectically to create a tragedy with some exciting melodramatic features. Xanthakis-Karamanos discusses the similarity of this play with the probable plot of Astydamas's Antigone *(as noted by Webster 1954, 304f.); and in Euripides'* Archelaus *the treacherous king Cisseus perished in the fiery pit he had prepared for the young hero who would marry his daughter and found a new dynasty in Macedonia.*

A Lucanian vase-painting showing a royally robed man killed in a sanctuary by a younger man with seemingly African features was tentatively connected with Theodectas's play by Webster.[11] *This is chronologically uncertain (the vase is variously dated between 410 and 350), and other subjects have been suggested (Heracles killing Busiris, Orestes killing Aegisthus). Even if Webster's identification of the figures is correct, a connection with Theodectas is unlikely as Aristotle's remarks do not suggest that Lynceus himself killed Danaus in this play.*

No other Lynceus *tragedies are known. Besides those of Phrynichus and Aeschylus (above),* Danaides *is the title of two of the thirteen tragedies listed in the Suda under the name of Timesitheus (*TrGF *no. 214), but dates and details are lacking.*

F 3a Aristotle, *Poetics*

(a) A *peripeteia* is the changing of actions into their opposite, as has been stated, and this as we say in accordance with probability or necessity, as for example in the (i.e. Sophocles') *Oedipus* . . . and in the *Lynceus*, as he (i.e. Lynceus) was being taken to be killed and Danaus was following so as to kill him, it came about from the previous actions that the one (i.e. Danaus) was killed and the other (i.e. Lynceus) was rescued.

(b) I call 'complication' the action which runs from the beginning up to the part immediately before it changes direction into good fortune or ill fortune, and 'resolution' that which runs from the beginning of this change of direction through to the end of the play. Thus in Theodectes' *Lynceus* the complication is

[11] Webster 1954, 304; Trendall–Webster 1971, 114 (pl. III.6.2); cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos 54. Descriptions and bibliography for the vase: *LIMC* III, 'Bousiris' no. 37, 'Danaos' no. 5; Todisco 2003, 108, 252, 393f. (L 22).

τε προπεπραγμένα καὶ ἡ τοῦ παιδίου λῆψις καὶ πάλιν ἡ αὐτῶν αἰτίασις, λύσις δ' ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς αἰτιάσεως τοῦ θανάτου μέχρι τοῦ τέλους.

ἡ αὐτῶν αἰτίασις, λύσις δ' ἡ Σ (cf. Tarán–Gutas *ad loc.*: λύσις δὲ ἡ conj. ms. Paris. Gr. 2038 omitting καὶ πάλιν . . . αἰτίασις) ἡ αὐτῶν δὴ Ξ τῆς αἰτιάσεως Π τῆς αἰτήσεως B [Σ uncertain]

ΜΑΥΣΩΛΟΣ

Pacelli 2016, 235–40; *SEHT* II.732, 767–72.

The tragedy seems to have been produced at Halicarnassus in 352 BC in connection with the funeral of the Carian ruler Mausolus (see ***T 1*** *and* ***T 6*** *with notes). Nothing remains of the text. According to Gellius (****T 6****), Theodectas was defeated by Theopompus in the contest of funeral orations, the tragedy was extant in his own time (2nd C. AD) and the Augustan-era scholar Hyginus reported that Theodectas 'gave more pleasure (*magis placuisse*) in this than in prose'. According to the Suda (****T 1****), Theodectas won the prize for the funeral oration, 'achieving great success with the tragedy that he spoke (μάλιστα εὐδοκιμήσας ἐν ᾗ εἶπε τραγῳδίᾳ)', although 'others' name Theopompus as the winner.*[12] *Gellius is surely the more accurate: Theodectas delivered an oration which was defeated by Theopompus and separately produced a successful tragedy. The 'prose' mentioned by Gellius was presumably the oration, and his wording suggests that the tragedy was performed after the contest, perhaps during the same (lengthy) funeral celebrations and certainly before Artemisia's own death a year or so later. The Suda's 'tragedy that he spoke' confuses the two, an easy enough mistake since in late antiquity the word* tragoidia *could refer to a range of solemn non-dramatic performances and even a dramatic text would be thought of as spoken (i.e. recited) rather than performed.*[13] *An alternative inter-*

[12] The Rhodian Library seems to have possessed a copy of his speech in the 2nd C. BC, along with the four books of Theodectas's *Art of Rhetoric* (presumably in Aristotle's summary, p. 131 above): »» *SEHT* II.770.

[13] Cf. Tzetzes in Dionysius **T 3** (below, p. 131 with notes 2–3). There is no need to suppose that the phrase ἐν ᾗ εἶπε τραγῳδίᾳ is corrupt as suggested by Sims 2020. For the sense of εἶπε see LSJ 'λέγω' III.13.

the prior actions and the seizing of the child and also their being charged, and the resolution is the part from their being charged with the death through to the end.

MAUSOLUS

pretation, that the tragedy was a recitation-drama delivered in lieu of a funeral oration, is improbable.[14]

The sources say nothing about the content of the tragedy, and modern opinions differ: either the achievements (or an achievement) of Mausolus himself (e.g. Welcker 1841, 1081, Webster 1954, 304, Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 17, 1990, 20, Pacelli 236–40) or an invented legend of an early ancestor with the same name, like Euripides' Archelaus *(e.g. K. O. Müller 1840, I.388, Hornblower 1982, 333–36).*[15] *A play about a historical figure performed immediately after his death would be unique in Greek literature so far as we know.*[16]

[14] It would hardly have been what Artemisia expected or what the contest required (and how long would it have taken?). For this interpretation see e.g. Del Grande 1933–34, 198f., Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 17 n. 4 and 1990 (with earlier refs.); for a separate tragedy e.g. Welcker 1841, 1079f., Zwierlein 1966, 154, Snell on **T 6**, *SEHT* II.770f. Sims suggests that Theodectas did not deliver an oration at all, but Hyginus and Gellius clearly imply that he did (the information presumably came from Hermippus: above, p. 131). Theodectas was after all both rhetorician and tragedian.

[15] Hornblower 1982, 336 notes some evidence for a mythical Mausolus, son of the Sun-god Helios.

[16] Griffith 2008, 68 suggests an anticipation of the Roman *fabula praetexta*, 'based on recent events and the careers of prominent local dignitaries'.

ΟΙΔΙΠΟΥΣ

Pacelli 2016, 113–39.

Athenaeus provides our only information. The speaker and context of ***F 4*** *(perhaps with the riddle that Athenaeus quotes before it,* ***F 18****) have been variously identified: either the Sphinx testing Oedipus in a report of their confrontation, or Oedipus testing the Sphinx or displaying his*

F 4 Athenaeus 10.451f (following **T 10** and **F 18**: the riddle is quoted without attribution by grammarians as an example of an *ainigma*, and repeated with two added verses in *Anth.Pal.* 14.40.)

. . . κἀν τῷ Οἰδίποδι δὲ τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ τὴν νύκτα καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν εἴρηκεν αἰνιττόμενος·

εἰσὶ κασίγνηται διτταί, ὧν ἡ μία τίκτει
τὴν ἑτέραν, αὐτὴ δὲ τεκοῦσ᾽ ὑπὸ τῆσδε τεκνοῦται.

ΟΡΕΣΤΗΣ

Pacelli 2016, 154–59.

The only fragment is cited by Aristotle to much the same effect as Alcmeon ***F 2*** *(see note there) but now illustrating the fallacy of division: it may be right for a husband-killer to die and right for a son to avenge*

F 5 Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1401a25–b2

ἄλλος τὸ τὸ διῃρημένον συντιθέντα λέγειν ἢ τὸ συγκείμενον διαιροῦντα . . . ἢ τὸ ἐν τῷ Ὀρέστῃ τῷ Θεοδέκτου. ἐκ διαιρέσεως γάρ ἐστιν,

δίκαιόν ἐστιν, ἥτις ἂν κτείνῃ πόσιν,

ἀποθνῄσκειν ταύτην, καὶ τῷ πατρί γε τιμωρεῖν τὸν υἱόν· οὐκοῦν καὶ ταῦτα ἃ πέπρακται. συντεθέντα γὰρ ἴσως οὐκέτι δίκαιον.

ΤΥΔΕΥΣ

Pacelli 2016, 160–64.

Aristotle mentions the play as an example of the best kind of recognition, i.e. through a syllogism. Like his other examples the recognition in Tydeus *will have led to a happy reunion. Aristotle's phrasing suggests that the speaker he quotes was Tydeus and his son therefore Diomedes, but this does not fit any known mythical scenario; Tydeus was generally*

OEDIPUS

ingenuity in some other context, or Tiresias alluding darkly to the hero's predicament. The plot, then, might have involved either the confrontation and Oedipus's triumph or his later downfall with the Sphinx episode recalled in retrospect as in Euripides' Oedipus *F 540a. See further the notes on* ***F 4*** *and* ***F 18****.*

F 4 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* (following **T 10** and **F 18**)

. . . and in the tragedy *Oedipus* he has described night and day riddlingly:

> There are two sisters, of whom the one gives birth to the other,
> and afterwards is herself given birth by her.

ORESTES

his father, but wrong for a son to avenge his father by killing his mother. In Theodectas's play the fallacious argument was probably made by Orestes defending himself in a trial, as in Eur. Orestes *546f., 934–43.*

F 5 Aristotle, *Rhetoric*

Another (fallacy) is to combine what is divided or divide what is combined . . . *(various examples)* . . . (another is) the one in Theodectes' *Orestes*, which results from division:

> It is just that any woman who kills her husband

should die, and that a son should avenge his father: so this is what has been done. For when they are combined it is perhaps no longer just.

TYDEUS

supposed to have died with the Seven at Thebes while Diomedes was still a boy (cf. Iliad *6.212f.). Karamanou (2019, 67f., accepted by Pacelli 169f.) suggests that the father might be Oeneus and the son Tydeus who in some accounts went into exile at Argos after killing his blood-relatives when they tried to usurp his ageing father's kingship (see on Chaere-*

mon's Oeneus*, pp. 106–9 above), but it seems unlikely that in this situation Oeneus would have needed to 'find' his son, or that the two would have had difficulty in recognizing each other after a relatively brief separation; such stories usually involve a separation when at least one of the parties was a child. Schierl (2006, 428) notes that in Antimachus's*

F 5a Aristotle, *Poetics* 1455a4–10

τετάρτη δὲ ἡ ἐκ συλλογισμοῦ, οἷον ἐν Χοηφόροις, ὅτι ὅμοιός τις ἐλήλυθεν, ὅμοιος δὲ οὐθεὶς ἀλλ' ἢ Ὀρέστης, οὗτος ἄρα ἐλήλυθεν. καὶ ἡ Πολυίδου τοῦ σοφιστοῦ περὶ τῆς Ἰφιγενείας· εἰκὸς γὰρ ἔφη τὸν Ὀρέστην συλλογίσασθαι ὅτι ἦ τ' ἀδελφὴ ἐτύθη καὶ αὐτῷ συμβαίνει θύεσθαι. καὶ ἐν τῷ Θεοδέκτου Τυδεῖ, ὅτι ἐλθὼν ὡς εὑρήσων τὸν υἱὸν αὐτὸς ἀπόλλυται.

ΦΙΛΟΚΤΗΤΗΣ

Pacelli 2016, 165–70.

The evidence included in ***F 5b*** *indicates that Theodectas's play treated the Achaeans' retrieval of Philoctetes and his bow from the island of Lemnos, like the similar tragedies of Aeschylus, Euripides and Sophocles (cf. Vol. 1, 114f. on Achaeus's* Philoctetes*, which was set later at Troy). Aristotle refers to a scene in which Philoctetes finally broke down under an attack of pain from his unhealing snakebite. His commentators add, one hopes reliably,*[17] *that this was witnessed by Neoptolemus and his comrades (which suggests that Theodectas followed Sophocles in making Neoptolemus a pivotal character), and that when he broke down Philoctetes called for his hand to be cut off (which is notable as in most accounts the snake had bitten his foot). The breakdown and demand for amputation were conventional: Aeschylus's Philoctetes wishes to be rid of his foot and longs for death as a release from pain (F 254–5); Sophocles' hero tries to conceal his pain from Neoptolemus and begs him to cut off his foot even if it kills him (*Phil*. 730–50). Theodectas may however have amplified the Sophoclean scene in a way that Aristotle found memorable. Xanthakis-Karamanos (1980, 37) argued that the wounded*

[17] Aspasius is notably vague and could have been guessing from his knowledge of Sophocles' play. His next comment, on Carcinus's *Alope*, is 'Apparently Carcinus brings in Cercyon being overcome by great griefs' (ἔοικε δὲ καὶ ὁ Καρκίνος εἰσάγειν τὸν Κερκύονα ἡττώμενον ὑπὸ μεγάλων ἀλγηδόνων).

Thebais *(from around 400 BC) Tydeus was said to have been raised amongst swineherds.*[18] *This might have led to Oeneus searching for his son years later and finding him without their immediately recognizing each other, but there is no evidence for such an episode.*

F 5a Aristotle, *Poetics*

The fourth (type of recognition) is from a syllogism, as in *Choephori*: 'Someone like me has come, no one is like me except Orestes, therefore Orestes has come.' Also Polyidus the sophist's point about Iphigenia: he argued that it was plausible that Orestes should compare the facts that his sister had been sacrificed and that now the same thing was happening to him. And in Theodectes' *Tydeus*, that having come to find his son he himself was perishing.

PHILOCTETES

hand was a major innovation as this would have prevented Philoctetes from using the bow, so that the Achaeans needed only to retrieve the bow and not the hero himself. Stephanopoulos (1984, 187) added that the island of Lemnos must have been inhabited (as in Aeschylus and Euripides but not in Sophocles) since Philoctetes could not have hunted for food without the bow, and that the unarmed hero could not have posed a threat to his adversaries as in Soph. Phil. *75f., 1293ff. (cf. Eur.* Phil. *F 789d(7)). All this is questionable. Theodectas's hero might have been only intermittently incapacitated by the pain of the wound, as in the other plays. More importantly, he was destined to be healed by Machaon at Troy (and in most accounts to kill Paris), and the oracle may have made it clear that he had to go there (cf. Stephanopoulos* ibid.*). Del Grande (1933–34, 196f.) suggested plausibly that the tragedy would have ended with the hero persuaded to go to Troy rather than commanded by the deified Heracles as in Sophocles' play.*

[18] Antimachus fr. 13 Wyss (Schol. *Iliad* 4.400). This probably underlies [Plutarch], *Proverbs used by the Alexandrians* 1.5 (*CPG* I, p. 322): '*Tydeus from the swineherd:* said of the uneducated. Oeneus raped Hipponous's daughter Periboea; when her father realized she was pregnant he handed her over to swineherds along with the child she had borne, Tydeus' (contrast the traditions in Apollodorus 1.8.4f.).

F 5b

(a) Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1150b9ff.

ὁμοίως δ' ἔχει καὶ περὶ ἐγκράτειαν καὶ ἀκρασίαν. οὐ γὰρ εἴ τις ἰσχυρῶν καὶ ὑπερβαλλουσῶν ἡδονῶν ἡττᾶται ἢ λυπῶν, θαυμαστόν, ἀλλὰ συγγνωμονικὸν εἰ ἀντιτείνων, ὥσπερ ὁ Θεοδέκτου Φιλοκτήτης ὑπὸ τοῦ ἕχεως πεπληγμένος ἢ ὁ Καρκίνου ἐν τῇ Ἀλόπῃ Κερκύων . . .

(b) Aspasius *ad loc.*, *CAG* vol. 19.1, p. 133.6–9

. . . ὥσπερ ὁ παρὰ τῷ Θεοδέκτῃ Φιλοκτήτης ὑπὸ τῆς ἕχεως πεπαρμένος κρύπτειν βουλόμενος τοὺς περὶ τὸν Νεοπτόλεμον μέχρι μέν τινος ἀντέχει, ὕστερον δὲ οὐχ ὑπομένων τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἀλγηδόνων φανερὸς γίνεται. τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὸν καὶ Σοφοκλῆς καὶ Αἰσχύλος.

(c) Anon. comm. *ad loc., CAG* vol. 20, p. 436.33–35 (~ 'Heliodorus', *CAG* 19.2, p. 149.20–22 without the quotation)

ὁ Θεοδέκτης τραγικὸς ἦν, καὶ παράγει τὴν χεῖρα δεδηγμένον τὸν Φιλοκτήτην ὑπὸ ὄφεως, καὶ μέχρι μὲν πολλοῦ ἀντέτεινε πρὸς τὰς λύπας καὶ τοὺς πόνους, ὕστερον δὲ ἡττήθη καὶ ἐβόα,

κόψατε τὴν ἐμὴν χεῖρα.

INCERTAE FABULAE

F 6 Athenaeus 10.454e (following Agathon **F 4**)

καὶ Θεοδέκτης δ' ὁ Φασηλίτης ἄγροικόν τινα ἀγράμματον παράγει καὶ τοῦτον τὸ τοῦ Θησέως ὄνομα διασημαίνοντα·

γραφῆς ὁ πρῶτος ἦν μεσόφθαλμος κύκλος·
ἔπειτα δισσοὶ κανόνες ἰσόμετροι πάνυ,
τούτους δὲ πλάγιος διὰ μέσου συνδεῖ κανών·
τρίτον δ' ἑλικτῷ βοστρύχῳ προσεμφερές.
ἔπειτα τριόδους πλάγιος ὣς ἐφαίνετο,
πέμπται δ' ἄνωθεν ἰσόμετροι ῥάβδοι δύο,
αὗται δὲ συντείνουσιν εἰς βάσιν μίαν·
ἕκτον δ' ὅπερ καὶ πρόσθεν εἶφ', ὁ βόστρυχος.

1 μεσόφθαλμος Welcker μαλακόφθαλμος Ath. μεσόμφαλος Valckenaer
3 διὰ μέσου Musurus διαμέτρου Ath.

F 5b

(a) Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*

The same holds for self-control and lack of self-control. It is not surprising if someone succumbs to overwhelming pleasures or griefs; on the contrary, it is understandable if he does this while striving against them, like Theodectes' Philoctetes suffering from the snakebite or Carcinus's Cercyon in his *Alope* (*Carcinus* **F 1b**) . . .

(b) Aspasius (2nd C. AD), commentary on **(a)**

. . . as Theodectes' Philoctetes, pierced by the snake and wanting to hide this from Neoptolemus and his comrades, holds out for a time but later, not enduring the intensity of his pains, reveals it. Aeschylus and Sophocles presented him in the same way.

(c) Anonymous commentary on **(a)**

Theodectes was a tragedian, and he brings on Philoctetes bitten in the hand by the snake. For a long time he held out against the pains and suffering, but later he was overcome and cried,

> Cut off my hand![19]

UNIDENTIFIED PLAYS

F 6 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* (following Agathon **F 4**)

Theodectes of Phaselis too brings on an illiterate peasant who likewise spells out Theseus's name:

> The first thing written was a circle with a central eye; then two rods of exactly equal length, and a crosswise rod in between held them together. The third was similar to a curled hair. Then a sort of crosswise trident could be seen; and fifth two staffs of equal length above, merging together into a single base. The sixth was the same that I said before, the hair.

[19] Nauck (1889, 803) thought this was paraphrase rather than direct quotation.

F 7 Stobaeus 1.1.1

Θεοδέκτου·

ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν ἀρχὴν δὲ ποιεῖσθαι πρέπον.

F 8 Stobaeus 1.3.22

Θεοδέκτου·

ὅστις δὲ θνητῶν μέμφεται τὰ θεῖ', ὅτι
οὐκ εὐθὺς ἀλλὰ τῷ χρόνῳ μετέρχεται
τοὺς μὴ δικαίους, πρόφασιν εἰσακουσάτω·
εἰ μὲν γὰρ αὐτίκ' ἦσαν αἱ τιμωρίαι,
πολλοὶ διὰ φόβον κοὐ δι' εὐσεβῆ τρόπον
θεοὺς ἂν ηὖξον· νῦν δὲ τῆς τιμωρίας
ἄπωθεν οὔσης τῇ φύσει χρῶνται βροτοί·
ὅταν δὲ φωραθῶσιν ἔρδοντες κακά,
τίνουσι ποινὰς ὑστέροισιν ἐν χρόνοις.

6 ηὖξον Meineke ηὔξαντο or ηὔξατο Stob. 8 ἔρδοντες κακά F. W. Schmidt (ἔρξαντες κακά Meineke) ὀφθέντες κακοί Stob.

F 9 Stobaeus 1.8.6

Θεοδέκτου·

ἀλλ' ὦ τάλαν Θυέστα, καρτέρει δακὼν
ὀργῆς χαλινόν· παρακελεύομαι δέ σοι
τεθηγμένῳ νῦν· ἀλλ' ὁ μυρίος χρόνος
τὰ πάντ' ἀμαυροῖ χὐπὸ χεῖρα λαμβάνει.

1 δακών Renehan, Stephanopoulos (δάκνων Grotius) δαθανών or διαθανών or θανών Stob. mss. 3 *sic* Nauck τεθηγμένον (*or* τεθειγ-) ἐν ἄλλοις μυρίοις χρόνοις Stob.

F 10 Stobaeus 3.10.8

Θεοδέκτου·

ὦ καλλιφεγγῆ λαμπάδ' εἰλίσσων φλογὸς
Ἥλιε, ποθεινὸν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις σέλας,
εἶδές τιν' ἄλλον πώποτ' εἰς οὕτω μέγαν
ἐλθόντ' ἀγῶνα καὶ δυσέκφευκτον κρίσιν;
ὅπου κατηγορεῖ μὲν ἐν λόγοισί μου
γυνή, πρὸς ὃν δ' εἴρηκε, τυγχάνει πόσις,
κρατοῦσι δ' οἵπερ καὶ κατηγοροῦσί μου.

F 7 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'That God is the creator of the things that are etc.'
Theodectas:

> And it is fitting to make a beginning from the gods.

F 8 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On justice, ordained by god etc.'
Theodectas:

> Any mortal who blames the divine powers because they do not pursue the unjust right away but only with time — let him listen to the reason. If punishments were instant, many would be exalting the gods through fear, and not because of a pious disposition.[5] But now, since punishment is distant, men indulge their nature; and when they are detected doing bad things, they pay a penalty in later times.

F 9 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On the nature of time etc.'
Theodectas:

> Come now, unhappy Thyestes, bite on your anger's bit and bear up. I'm advising you now when your anger is whetted, but measureless time dulls everything and gets it under control.

F 10 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On injustice'
Theodectas:

> O Sun, driving on its circuit your finely shining torch of flame, whose rays all men desire: did you ever before now see anyone else facing so great a contest, so inescapable a judgment? Here a woman is accusing me with words,[5] and the one she has said them to is her husband. The very ones accusing me are in control!

F 11 Stobaeus 3.29.35

Θεοδέκτου·

πολλὰ δεῖ
μοχθεῖν τὸν ἥξοντ᾽ εἰς ἔπαινον εὐκλεῶς·
ῥᾳθυμία δὲ τὴν παραυτίχ᾽ ἡδονὴν
λαβοῦσα λύπας τῷ χρόνῳ τίκτειν φιλεῖ.

F 12 Stobaeus 3.32.14

Θεοδέκτου·

ἅπαντ᾽ ἐν ἀνθρώποισι γηράσκειν ἔφυ
καὶ πρὸς τελευτὴν ἔρχεται τα⟨κ⟩τοῦ χρόνου,
πλὴν ὡς ἔοικε τῆς ἀναιδείας μόνον·
αὕτη δ᾽ ὅσῳπερ αὔξεται θνητῶν γένος,
τοσῷδε μείζων γίγνεται καθ᾽ ἡμέραν. 5

2 verse deleted by Nauck (inserted between 1 and 3 in ms. S, included normally in others) τα⟨κ⟩τοῦ Buecheler τὰ τοῦ Stob.

F 12a Stobaeus 4.22.54, *an excerpt now lost from the chapter 'On marriage'*

F 13 Stobaeus 4.22.67

Θεοδέκτου·

ὅταν γὰρ ἄλοχον εἰς δόμους ἄγῃ πόσις,
οὐχ ὡς δοκεῖ γυναῖκα λαμβάνει μόνον,
ὁμοῦ δὲ τῇδ᾽ ἔτ᾽ εἰσκομίζεται λαβὼν
καὶ δαίμον᾽ ἤτοι χρηστὸν ἢ τοὐναντίον.

F 14 Stobaeus 4.26.8

Θεοδέκτου·

γονέων τὰ τέκν᾽ ἔσωσαν αἱ συμβουλίαι.

τὰ τέκν᾽ ἔσωσαν Mekler τὰ τέκνα σῴζουσιν Stob.

F 15 Stobaeus 4.29.5

Θεοδέκτου·

ἐγὼ μὲν οὔποτ᾽ εὐγένειαν ᾔνεσα
τὴν προστάταισι χρωμένην ἀναξίοις.

F 11 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, ‘On willingness to strive’
Theodectas:

> The man who will achieve praise with good repute must labour much. Idleness gets the pleasure of the moment but usually breeds miseries in time.

F 12 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, ‘On shamelessness’
Theodectas:

> All things in human life age naturally and reach an end of their appointed time, except it seems for shamelessness alone. The more the race of mortals is increased, the more she becomes greater day by day.

F 12a *See opposite*

F 13 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, ‘On marriage’
Theodectas:

> When a husband brings a wife into his house, he doesn’t just get a woman, as he expects, but also brings in with her a daimon that may be either good or the opposite.

F 14 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, ‘How fathers should behave towards their children’
Theodectas:

> Parents’ counsels save their children.

F 15 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, ‘On nobility’
Theodectas:

> I have never approved a nobility that follows unworthy leaders.

F 16 Stobaeus 4.41.25 (v. 3 Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 6.2.14.2)

Θεοδέκτου·

πολυσπερεῖ μέν, ὦ γέρον, καθ' Ἑλλάδα
φήμῃ πλανᾶται καὶ διέγνωσται πάλαι,
τὸ μὴ βεβαίους τὰς βροτῶν εἶναι τύχας.

F 17 Strabo 15.1.24

Ὀνησικρίτῳ δὲ δοκεῖ τόδε τὸ ὕδωρ αἴτιον εἶναι τῶν ἐν τοῖς ζῴοις ἰδιωμάτων . . . τοῦτο μὲν οὖν εὖ, οὐκέτι δὲ καὶ τὸ τοῦ μέλανας εἶναι καὶ οὐλότριχας τοὺς Αἰθίοπας ἐν ψιλοῖς τοῖς ὕδασι τὴν αἰτίαν τιθέναι, μέμφεσθαι δὲ τὸν Θεοδέκτην εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν ἥλιον ἀναφέροντα τὸ αἴτιον, ὅς φησιν οὕτως·

οἷς ἀγχιτέρμων ἥλιος διφρηλατῶν
σκοτεινὸν ἄνθος ἐξέχρωσε λιγνύος
εἰς σώματ' ἀνδρῶν καὶ συνέστρεψεν κόμας
μορφαῖς ἀναυξήτοισι συντήξας πυρί.

4 πυρί Kramer πυρός Strab.

F 18 Athenaeus 10.451f (following **T 10**)

. . . οἷον τὸν περὶ τῆς σκιᾶς· ἔφη γὰρ εἶναί τινα φύσιν, ἢ περὶ τὴν γένεσιν καὶ φθίσιν ἐστὶ μεγίστη, περὶ δὲ τὴν ἀκμὴν ἐλαχίστη. λέγει δ' οὕτως·

τίς φύσις οὔθ' ὅσα γαῖα φέρει τροφὸς οὔθ' ὅσα πόντος
οὔτε βροτοῖσιν ἔχει γυίων αὔξησιν ὁμοίαν,
ἀλλ' ἐν μὲν γενέσει πρωτοσπόρῳ ἐστὶ μεγίστη,
ἐν δὲ μέσαις ἀκμαῖς μικρά, γήρᾳ δὲ πρὸς αὐτῷ
μορφῇ καὶ μεγέθει μείζων πάλιν ἐστὶν ἁπάντων;

F 16 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'That human prosperity is insecure etc.'

Theodectas:

> Old man, it roams through Greece in widespread report and has long been discerned that mortals' fortunes are not secure.

F 17 Strabo, *Geography*

Onesicritus thinks this water (i.e. of Indian rivers) is the cause of the peculiarities in their animals . . . . Well, that's fine, but not his also making the waters alone the cause of the Ethiopians being dark-skinned and woolly-haired, and criticizing Theodectes when he relates the cause to the Sun itself, saying:

> The Sun, driving his chariot close by, colours men's bodies with a smoke-dark bloom and twists their hair together, fusing it in ungrowing shapes with its heat.

F 18 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* (following **T 10**)

. . . such as the one about the shadow. He said that there is a certain creature that is biggest around the time of its birth and death, and smallest at its peak. This is how he puts it:

> What creature is not of those nurtured by land or sea, nor do its limbs grow like those of mortals, but it is biggest when first sown and born, small at its midway peak, and as it meets old age is bigger again in shape and size than anything?[5]

Notes on Theodectas

T 1

See above, p. 130 for the biographical details and on *Mausolus* (pp. 144f.) for the circumstances of the funeral contest. The competitors at the funeral were all pupils of Isocrates. **Naucrates of Erythrae** was a rhetor and author of epidectic speeches (Cicero, *De Orat.* 2.94, 3.173, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Isaeus* 19, *Art of Rhetoric* 6.1, Quintilian 3.6.3: »» Radermacher 1903, 193f.). The Suda's notice for **Isocrates of Apollonia** (*ι* 653, partially reproduced as Theodectas T 5) lists five other epideictic speeches that must have survived for some time. **Theopompus** of Chios is best known as a prolific historian (his *Hellenica* covered the

years 411–394 and his *Philippic History* the period of Philip II's reign). He also practised as a rhetor and published epideictic speeches and political pamphlets. **in the 106th Olympiad (356/5–353/2 BC):** Mausolus died in spring or early summer 352, his wife Artemisia in 351/0 (»» Hornblower 1982, 39–41). **the tragedy that he spoke:** see above, p. 144. **a rhetorical textbook in verse:** see above, p. 131 on Theodectas's *Art of Rhetoric*, which must have been in prose. Matelli 2007, 171 suggests aligning the 'textbook in verse' with Stephanus's 'rhetorical speeches numbering . . . lines' (**T 2**), but the speeches there are speeches and the lines (ἔπη) are not lines of verse. The Suda may simply reflect a misinterpretation of the word ἔπη, as Ritschl (1866 [1840–1], 177–9) and Rohde (1879, 566f.) supposed. **{And he died in Athens etc.}:** the sentence belongs in the Suda's next entry (*θ* 139) concerning Theodectas's son: see above, p. 130.

T 2

See above, pp. 130f. for the biographical details, with **T 15** for Theodectas's death and tomb at Athens. **50 tragedies:** probably including some satyr-plays, cf. the Suda's '50 plays' (and above, pp. 131f.). **rhetorical textbooks:** above, p. 131. **speeches numbering . . . lines: †καί†** probably represents an alphabetic number such as ´κ (20,000) or ´ς, (6,000, Diels). **ἐπῶν** here means lines of prose: cf. Theopompus F 25* (from Photius, *Bibl.* 176 cited by Ritschl, previous note), οὐκ ἐλαττόνων μὲν ἢ δισμυρίων ἐπῶν τοὺς ἐπιδεικτικοὺς τῶν λόγων, 'his epidectic speeches numbering not fewer than 20,000 lines'; LSJ 'ἔπος' IVd. There is no reason to doubt that Stephanus refers to a collection of speeches written in prose. Eustathius on Dionysius Periegetes 855 repeats the threefold division of Theodectas's writings: τέχνην ῥητορικὴν καὶ λόγους ἀγαθούς . . . καὶ τραγῳδίας ν´, 'an *Art of Rhetoric*, fine speeches and 50 tragedies'.

the following elegy: the two couplets are almost certainly unrelated and from unknown sources; the change from descriptive statement (**This land hides . . .**) to personal declaration (**I donned eight . . . crowns**) is unprecedented (Page 1981, 432 cites one inexact parallel not from an epitaph, *IG* 7.430). Crönert ascribed the first couplet to Lobon of Argos (3rd C. BC?), along with sixteen other similarly structured epitaphs and statue-dedications quoted by Diogenes Laertius and others, and surmised that the second couplet came from the real epitaph on Theodectas's tomb outside Athens (**T 15**). Lobon's biographies seem to have contained a mixture of factual and fictitious material about the lives of mythical and historical figures, but his name is found only in Diogenes Laertius 1.34 (concerning Thales) and 1.112 (concerning Empedocles), and the work *On Poets* only in the latter (the name was conjectured by Bergk and printed by Radt in the *Life of Sophocles*, *TrGF* 4 T 1.71, in connection with an epitaph for Sophocles). Crönert's ascriptions were accepted by Gabathuler 1937 (nos 43–59) and Lloyd-Jones–Parsons 1983 (nos 504–20), but most if not all of them are questionable. Garulli (2004) eliminates all except those for the seven sages,

Empedocles and perhaps a few others not including Theodectas (»» Garulli 24, 118–20, 163). Gutzwiller 2008 doubts that Lobon composed any of these verses rather than compiling them from elsewhere. Fehling (1985, 35f.) argued that Diogenes' references to Lobon were pure invention. Snell in *TrGF* and Page (above) print all four lines with no ascription and no mention of Lobon. **[unageing**: the manuscripts' ἀκήρατος is unmetrical (always ἀκήρᾰτος) and not very appropriate ('untainted'). ἀγήρᾱτος is not unusual, e.g. *IG* II^2 11103, *Anth.Pal.* 7.253.4, *Anth.Gr.Appendix* 2.126a.3.**]**

T 4

From Plutarch's account of Alexander's advance from Lycia into Pamphylia in 334/3. The anecdote, if true, refers to the younger Theodectas (above, p. 130), but it was probably invented to make a connection between Alexander and one of Phaselis's famous citizens. It may not have been part of the supposed letter, and in any case Plutarch's references to Alexander's letters are generally to fictitious collections produced in the Hellenistic period (»» Pearson 1955, 443–50). The main street of the site of Phaselis is today lined with statue-bases from the second century AD.

T 6

See on **T 1** for the contest at Halicarnassus and pp. 144f. for the tragedy *Mausolus*. **Isocrates himself:** Gellius confuses Isocrates of Apollonia (**T 1** n.) with his more famous teacher who was 83 or 84 years old at the time (see also **T 8** n.). **Hyginus in his *Examples*:** this is the only remnant of this work by the distinguished scholar Gaius Julius Hyginus, Palatine Librarian under Augustus. The book was perhaps a collection of instructive historical anecdotes like that of Valerius Maximus (»» *FRHist* I.480–1). This might have included an account of Mausolus's reign, or the famous funeral, or the building of the Mausoleum.

T 7

Ps.-Plutarch's list of Isocrates' pupils includes these and other well-known Athenian orators and politicians. It is reproduced with minor differences in Photius's *Library* (cod. 260, pp. 486b36–487a5), and with more extensive ones in the *Life of Isocrates* found in Byzantine manuscripts. Both of these are included in *TrGF*'s **T 7**. *TrGF* 1^2.354 adds Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Isaeus* 19, a list of orators contemporary with Isocrates including Theodectas.

T 8

See above on **T 1**. **Isocrates of Athens** was sixty years older than Theopompus, so this is again a mistake for Isocrates of Apollonia as in **T 6**. Theopompus is wrongly synchronized with the older Isocrates elsewhere, e.g. Suda *θ* 172.

T 10

From Athenaeus's discussion of riddles, 10.448b–459c: see on Agathon F 4 in Vol. 1, and below on **F 4**, **F 6**, **F 18**. Hermippus produced mainly biographical works at Alexandria in the third century BC (*FGrHist* 1026: »» *New Pauly*, 'Hermippus of Smyrna' (F. Montanari); Bollansée 1999).

T 15

The tomb would have been northwest of the city, about three kilometers beyond the city walls. For suggested identifications of the site see Frazer on Pausanias 1.37.4. **Kuamites** ('Bean-hero') must have been the hero credited in Athenian lore with first cultivating beans, like Triptolemus who learned the cultivation of cereals from Demeter. His name is found elsewhere only in lexica (Hesychius κ 4341 (corrupt), Photius κ 1137, *Lex. Seguer.* p. 274.14 Bekker), the name of the market only here.

F 1

The debate between Ajax and Odysseus for the award of Achilles' arms was a frequent topic in tragedy (see on Carcinus's *Ajax*, pp. 64f. above), in the schools from the late fifth century onwards (see especially Antisthenes F 14–15 Caizzi), and in later poetry (Ovid, *Met.* 12.620–13.381, Quintus of Smyrna, *Posthomerica* 5.1–316). In Antisthenes' declamations, as in the later sources, Ajax asserts his prowess in battle, accusing Odysseus of cowardice, and Odysseus replies that Ajax's 'courage' is just crude stupidity and that his own lone efforts have been both genuinely courageous and more effective. The arguments that Aristotle ascribes to Theodectas refer to *Iliad* 10.218ff., where Diomedes calls for a comrade to join him in infiltrating the Trojan encampment; many volunteer, including Ajax, and Diomedes chooses Odysseus for his courage, intelligence and closeness to the goddess Athena. Theodectas's Ajax subverts this by imputing a concealed motive to Diomedes. The topic of Diomedes' choice recurs without this ploy in Ovid, *Met.* 13.98–100, 238–42, 350f. and in Quintus 5.253ff.

Aristotle returns to the topic in *Rhet.* 1416b8–14 without naming Theodectas: 'It is open both to the one casting aspersions and the one resolving them, since the same thing may have been done for different reasons, for the former to choose the worse motive so as to disparage it and the latter to choose the better one; for example, in the case of Diomedes preferring Odysseus, one could say it was because he considered Odysseus the best, and the other not because of that but because, being worthless, he was the only one who did not compete with him'.

The explanations of these passages in an anonymous medieval commentary on the *Rhetoric* (*CAG* vol. 21.2, pp. 141.27ff. and 144.1ff.) are probably not based on knowledge of Theodectas's text (cf. Martinelli 2010, 70 and above on Carcinus **F 1e**).

F 1a

Part of a long extract from a lost work of the Neoplatonist philosopher Porphyry (3rd C. AD) in which various speakers discussed and illustrated the prevalence of alleged plagiarisms in Greek literature (cf. Moschion **F 10** n.). Eusebius uses Porphyry's examples in arguing that the derivativeness of Greek culture justifies the Christian rejection of Greek philosophy. Porphyry's speakers draw on a variety of earlier collections of famous authors' 'plagiarisms', often perversely identified as such (in this case Theodectas's verses are better regarded as an allusion to Medea's famous statement in Euripides' play). The formal gnomic statement, no doubt introducing a particular case, may have come at or near the beginning of his play, like Soph. *Trach.* 1ff. and others (see above, p. 138 and Critias(?) **F 17**.1 with note in Vol. 1). The tone of **no creature more wretched** is poignant like Medea's rather than critical (cf. Arnott on Alexis fr. 145.1); so Eriphyle's crime can hardly be the subject.[20] The speaker was probably Alphesiboea as proposed by Welcker 1841, 1075, though he did not suggest a context.

[σαφής here means 'accurate' or **true** as in e.g. Eur. *Helen* 21 (cf. LSJ 'σαφής' I.2). The phrasing does not support Stephanopoulos's suggestion that the proverb was quoted in order to be questioned or corrected in the following lines. He rightly notes however that the earliest other instances of the phrase **ὑμνεῖται λόγος**, lit. 'the saying is hymned', i.e. oft-repeated, are in Plato's *Laws* (653d6, 778d7). For **φυτόν**, **creature** see LSJ II.1.**]**

F 2

Aristotle's discussion is self-explanatory so far as it goes and merely paraphrased in the anonymous medieval commentary cited in Snell's apparatus (*CAG* 21.2, p. 134: cf. Stephanus, *ibid.* p. 301). The context was probably Alcmeon's first meeting with Alphesiboea (above, p. 139). **she should have died . . . I should not have killed her:** Orestes' matricide is criticized similarly in Eur. *Electra* 1244 (Castor) 'Her punishment is just, but not your deed', *Iph.Taur.* 559 (Iphigenia) 'How well did he perform a righteous wrong!', *Orestes* 538f. (Tyndareus) 'My daughter died justly, but should not have died at his hands', 823 (Chorus) 'To do wrong well is specious impiety'; but the rhetorician Theodectas makes the point explicit (**one should distinguish etc.**). See also below on *Orestes* (**F 5)**.

---

[20] Xanthakis-Karamanos (1980, 151f.) suggested Alphesiboea condemning Eriphyle. Del Grande (1933/34, 194–6) had suggested Eriphyle defending herself when menaced by Alcmeon, with the implausible inference that the play included both the matricide and the events at Psophis; against this see Xanthakis-Karamanos *ibid.*, Pacelli 82f.

F 3

See introduction to *Helen(?)* above, pp. 140f. On the topic of 'good birth' and 'nobility' (*eugeneia*) see **F 15** below and Astydamas **F 8** with notes.

F 3a

Passage **(a)** makes it clear that Lynceus was about to be put to death by Danaus when something caused Danaus to be killed while Lynceus was rescued. Passage **(b)** is corrupt at a crucial point in the Byzantine ms. tradition (Ξ in the apparatus), but according to the text printed here the charging is the last step in Aristotle's complication (*desis*) and the first step in his resolution (*lusis*); thus Lynceus and Hypermestra were charged with a killing, Lynceus was condemned and led away to be killed by Danaus, and this led to Danaus being killed and Lynceus saved. Whose death the couple were charged with is wholly unclear. Else's suggestion (1957, 521) that Danaus might have concealed Abas after seizing him and then accused Lynceus of killing his own son is hardly plausible. Karamanou suggests that it was Danaus, not Lynceus, who was charged, i.e. with complicity in the killing of the sons of Aegyptus as indicated in Euripides' *Orestes* 872 and the relevant scholia. This too seems implausible since a trial of Danaus could not have led to Lynceus facing execution (and **the death** is an odd way of referring to the deaths of Aegyptus's forty-nine sons).

[In passage **(b)**, **ἡ αὐτῶν αἰτίασις, λύσις δ' ἡ** appears to have been the reading of ms. Σ (the lost Greek source of the lost Syriac source of the extant Arabic translation), where the Byzantine ms. tradition (Ξ) has the meaningless ἡ αὐτῶν δὴ: see Tarán–Gutas 2012, 277f., 405–7 with comments on earlier conjectures (ἡ αὐτῶν δή⟨λωσις⟩ Christ *et al.*, ἡ αὐτῶν ἀπαγωγή Vahlen); also Tarán 2016, 794 on the conjectural reading in ms. Paris. Gr. 2038. Bywater simply deleted δὴ to give ἡ αὐτῶν (*sc.* λῆψις), i.e. the seizing of the parents, but the seizing cannot have been the *last* step in the *desis* as Aristotle defines it (see also Karamanou 2019, 80). **τῆς αἰτιάσεως τοῦ θανάτου** means **their being charged with the death**, not 'condemnation to death' (Webster 1954, 394). αἰτίασις + gen. is 'holding responsible/culpable for': cf. Hdt. 5.70 εἶχον αἰτίην τοῦ φόνου τούτου 'they were held responsible for this bloodshed'; Lucian, *Tyrann.* 12 αἰτίας θανάτου διττάς 'two kinds of responsibility for a death'; Cassius Dio 74.1.1.10 ὑπ' αἰτίασιν . . . φόνου, 'culpable of murder'. Janko (1987, 119f.) prefers ms. B's reading τῆς αἰτήσεως τοῦ θανάτου and translates 'the demand for the death penalty', but this would be τῆς αἰτήσεως θανάτου.**]**

F 4

The metre, dactylic hexameter, is conventional for poetic riddles (e.g. Eur. *Oedipus* F 540a and here in **F 18**), and for some other special functions such as oracles (»» Snell 1971, 167 n. 26, Monda 2000, 31f.). Monda 29–39 reviews opinions about the plot of Theodectas's play, arguing that **F 4** and **F 18** are both

from *Oedipus* and spoken by the hero in an early scene, alluding unconsciously to his own predicament (**F 18** the shadow as man, **F 4** Oedipus's incestuous relationship with his mother and children). That **F 4** alludes to the incest was suggested by Robert (1915, 493, identifying Tiresias as possible speaker), cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 98, Pacelli 125–27.

F 5, F 5a, F 5b

See introductions to *Orestes*, *Tydeus* and *Philoctetes*, pp. 146–49.

F 6

The last of the three alphabetic descriptions of the name Theseus quoted by Athenaeus (10.454) after Euripides' *Theseus* F 382 and Agathon's *Telephus* **F 4** (see in Vol. 1). Theodectas's version is highly derivative (cf. Martano 2007, Pacelli 141–44, Dunn 2019, 261–3): line 1 ≈ Agathon line 1; 2 **κανόνες** cf. Agathon 2; 2–3 structured like Eur. 5–6; 4 **βοστρύχῳ** cf. Eur. 7, **προσεμφερές** cf. Agathon 3, Eur. 13; 5 ≈ Agathon 4; 7 ≈ Eur. 12; 8 structured like Agathon 6. These verbal similarities are accompanied by a significant difference of style, as Dunn points out. Whereas Euripides' herdsman struggles realistically to describe the letters in mundane terms and Agathon's speaker explains them in a series of riddling one-liners, Theodectas's peasant talks in neat geometrical terms, 'as if explaining how to write them'.

The play may well have been a *Theseus* as in Euripides, although Agathon's use of his version in a *Telephus* makes this uncertain. Euripides' herdsman probably described the name seen on the hero's ship as he landed in Crete to rescue the victims of the Minotaur. Theodectas's plot may have been similar, but the device could have been adapted to many of Theseus's adventures: »» Monda 2000, 39–47, Pacelli 145–47. There is no particular reason to think that any of these three plays was a satyr-play (cf. on Agathon's *Telephus* in Vol. 1).

[Stobaeus's μαλακόφθαλμος κύκλος, 'a soft-eyed circle', is hard to explain; Cipolla 2003, 213 suggests it refers to 'an eye half-closed, with the eyelid half-lowered', i.e. a barred theta. Valckenaer's μεσόμφαλος, 'with a central navel', makes Theodectas's first line identical with Agathon's. Welcker's **μεσόφθαλμος** seems a reasonable compromise.**]**

F 7

to make a beginning from the gods: i.e. to start by requesting their favour and assistance (cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 27b12–c7). This is aptly the first excerpt in the first chapter of Stobaeus's anthology, 'That God is the creator of the things that are'. A request for divine inspiration is conventional in Greek poetry, e.g. Hes. *Theog.* 1, 36, *Homeric Hymns passim*, Theognis 1f. (»» Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 130). In a tragic context the occasion might have been a call for help as in Eur. *Helen* 1024ff., where Theonoe advises Helen and Menelaus to beseech

Aphrodite and Hera to assist their return to Greece (ἐκ τῶν θεῶν δ' ἄρχεσθε . . . , 'Begin from gods . . . ': Pacelli 171).

F 8

That the gods and Justice always observe wrongdoing and will punish offenders in due course was a fundamental doctrine of early Greek poetry, e.g. Hes. *Works* 248–73, Solon F 13 *IEG*, Theognis 197–208, and often in tragedy (»» Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 123–26, Pacelli 174f.); cf. Dionysius **F 5?** below. Why the punishments were often delayed and wrongdoers allowed to prosper became a subject of theological debate and doubts about the gods' righteousness, first attested in Solon's assurance that Zeus will punish an offender's descendants even if he himself escapes (fr. 13.32 *IEG*). See further Plutarch *On those punished belatedly by the divine* (*Mor.* 548–568). The speaker here offers an unusual justification: the gods delay their punishments so that those mortals who are inclined to do wrong are not inhibited from doing so and will think they are getting away with their crimes, cf. e.g. Hes. *Works* 217f., Theognis 201f., Eur. F 564, F 835). This argument might be thought to put the gods in a rather discreditable light. Lines 5–7 seem to suggest that it is justified because mortals (or at least some mortals) are naturally inclined to impiety and wrongdoing and so naturally deserve to suffer the gods' wrath. For the phrasing **τῇ φύσει χρῶνται, (they) indulge their** (unruly) **nature** cf. Ar. *Clouds* 1078, Isocrates 7.38, 15.36, Plato, *Laws* 880e2.

We know nothing about the speaker or dramatic context, so it is not possible to say what impact the argument was intended to have (Pacelli 178f. assumes it expresses the poet's personal conviction). Xanthakis-Karamanos suggests it may allude specifically to punishment in the afterlife as propounded by Plato and others, but **in later times** is too vague to convey this (cf. Pacelli 179–82). For the plural **ὑστέροισιν ἐν χρόνοις** cf. Eur. F 1007d, Pl. *Laws* 865a4, 872e9. Attribution to *Lynceus* (Del Grande 1933–34, 198) is a faint possibility.

[5. διὰ φόβον: an unusual 'split resolution' (⏑ ⏑|⏑ –), cf. Astydamas **F 2a**.13 with note. **6. ηὖξον, would be exalting:** for the sense see LSJ 'αὐξάνω' I.2. ηὔξα(ν)το from εὔχομαι 'pray' (Stob. mss.) is unmetrical and ungrammatical. **8. doing bad things**: **ἔρδοντες κακά** is a plausible correction of an awkwardly phrased text ('whenever they are detected having been seen bad'). The present tense **ἔρδοντες** is apt: the gods detect the wrongdoers as they commit their crimes but save the punishments for later.**]**

F 9

A consolation probably addressed to Thyestes after the infamous feast, but other contexts are possible in his complicated and much-dramatized story (see on Agathon's *Thyestes*, Vol. 1, pp. 156f.). **your anger is whetted:** for the metaphor cf. Aesch. *Supp.* 186f., *Sept.* 715, Eur. *Or.* 1625, LSJ 'θήγω' I.2 and II.

measureless time dulls everything: a conventional topic, e.g. Soph. *Ajax* 646f. ἅπανθ' ὁ μακρὸς κἀναρίθμητος χρόνος | φύει τ' ἄδηλα καὶ φανέντα κρύπτεται ('long, unmeasured time makes all things obscure and hides what has appeared'), 714 πάνθ' ὁ μέγας χρόνος μαραίνει ('great time wears all away'), F 954 χρόνος δ' ἀμαυροῖ πάντα κεἰς λήθην ἄγει ('Time dulls everything and brings it to oblivion'), Chaeremon **F 22**, cf. Simonides fr. 531.5 *PMG* οὔθ' ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος ('not even all-subduing time shall obscure' the memory of the Spartan dead at Thermopylae); time soothes anger, Critias **F 22?** with note in Vol. 1. **[**The aorist **δακών** is preferred to Grotius's present δάκνων (i.e. the act of biting rather than its continuation) by Renehan in *TrGF* 5.1112 and Stephanopoulos 1988b, 14, cf. Pacelli 191f. Amongst many parallels note Soph. *Trach.* 976f. ἀλλ' ἴσχε δακὼν στόμα σόν 'bite your lip and keep silent', Menand. *Samia* 356 δακὼν δ' ἀνάσχου, καρτέρησον εὐγενῶς 'bite down and be patient, bear up nobly', and for horses biting on the bit e.g. [Aesch.] *PV* 1009f., Eur. *Hipp.* 1223f., Pl. *Phaedrus* 254d.**]**

F 10

The speaker replies to an accusation made by a woman to her husband, probably in a 'Potiphar's wife' situation where the speaker has rejected her advances and she retaliates with a false accusation of sexual assault. The speaker then calls upon the all-seeing **Sun** as a witness. In lines 3–4 **so great a contest** (**μέγαν ἀγῶνα**) emphasizes the defendant's peril, as often in lawcourt speeches (e.g. Antiphon 6.3, Isocr. 17.1, Dem. 57.1) and in agonistic contexts in Euripides (9x, e.g. *Hipp.* 496, *Hec.* 229). Lines 5–6 stress that the accuser is a **woman** (**γυνή** in enjambment) and uses **words** (implying that these are suspect especially because they come from a woman). Plots of this kind are found in Euripides' *Stheneboea*, *Hippolytus*, *Peleus* (probably), *Phoenix* (with a variation), and in the *Tennes* of uncertain authorship (Vol. 1, pp. 212–17). Theodectas might have used any of these stories or some other one (cf. Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 58). Other suggestions as to the plot can be discounted,[21] as can the idea that these were the opening lines of a tragedy.[22]

1–4. O Sun etc.: an elaboration of the opening of Euripides' *Phoenician Women* (now *Pho.* 3 following the interpolated lines 1–2), Ἥλιε, θοαῖς ἵπποισιν εἰλίσσων φλόγα, 'Sun, with swift horses driving your flame on its circling

[21] Orestes accused of matricide by Helen, Del Grande 1933–34, 200; an *Alcmeon*, Snell in *TrGF* (comparing **F 1a** but without further explanation); Helen denounced to Menelaus by Hecuba, Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 67f. (see on lines 5–7).

[22] Snell in *TrGF*, prompted by the echo of the first line of Euripides' *Phoenician Women* (see below on lines 1–2); also Haslam 1975, 157, *MusTr* 292 n. 13. Criticized by Stephanopoulos 1988b, 15f.

course'. Note also Eur. *Tro.* 860 ὦ καλλιφεγγὲς ἡλίου σέλας, *Phaethon* F 781.11 ὦ καλλιφεγγὲς Ἥλι(ε), *Hipp.* 455 ἡ καλλιφεγγὴς . . . Ἕως (Dawn). For further analysis see Pacelli 96–102. **εἰλίσσων** (lit. 'whirling')**:** the verb is both a favourite of Euripides in various contexts and the Homeric term for driving a chariot around a racecourse (*Iliad* 23.309, 320). Theodectas like Euripides exploits the sound-effect **εἰλίσσων . . . Ἥλιε**. **did you ever . . . see:** the Sun sees and witnesses everything, e.g. *Odyssey* 8.270f., Aesch. *Cho.* 986f., Soph. *Ajax* 845ff., *OC* 869.

5–7. The accuser is **a woman** addressing **her husband**, so in line 7 **the very ones who accuse me** refers to the woman: the 'generalizing' masculine plural adds indignation to the complaint, suggesting that the situation is categorically unfair. Nauck altered **κρατοῦσι** to κρινοῦσι ('the very ones who accuse me will give judgment'), but lines 5–6 clearly distinguish the accuser (the woman) from the judge (her husband). Xanthakis-Karamanos accepted κρινοῦσι and understood πόσις as 'my husband', identifying the speaker as Helen accused by Hecuba before Menelaus as in Euripides' *Trojan Women*;[23] but (1) **πόσις** following **γύνη** is naturally understood as **her husband**, (2) neither κρινοῦσι nor κρατοῦσι is applicable to the captive Hecuba, and (3) a complaint by Helen that she is being accused by a woman and judged by her own husband would be rather pointless. The speaker's point is that the accuser has control *because* the judge is her husband and will therefore favour her.

F 11

Acceptance of toil (*philoponia*) preferred to the pleasures of idleness: see on Agathon **F 21** in Vol. 1. Idleness pleasant but destructive, also Eur. *Hipp.* 375–84, *Antiope* F 183, 187–8.

F 12

Anaideia, **Shamelessness**, is personified as a divine power, gaining stature as the human race increases. In Hesiod, *Works* 197–201 the deities Aidôs 'Shame' and Nemesis 'Indignation' will leave the earth when immorality prevails amongst the mortals of the corrupt Age of Iron. Theognis 289–92 and 647f. laments that Aidôs has now left the earth and only Anaideia and Hybris remain. Cf. also Eur. *HF* 557 with Wilamowitz's commentary. In Menander fr. 201 *PCG* (quoted by Stobaeus with our fragment and Theognis 647f.) Anaideia is 'now the greatest of gods', dominating all. **[**Line 2 is added between 1 and 3 in ms. S of Stobaeus but present in other mss. Nauck thought it 'obviously spurious' and may have been

[23] Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 67f., criticized by Stephanopoulos 1984, 180 and 1988b, 15–18, Pacelli 92–6 (suggesting Bellerophon defending himself against Stheneboea's accusation).

right. Without it there is a sharper contrast between the ceaseless growth of shamelessness and the natural decline of everything else.**]**

F 13

A traditional thought quoted in Stobaeus 4.22c, 'That the disposition of those joined together makes marriage beneficial for some and unfortunate for others', with e.g. Hesiod, *Works* 702–5, Semonides fr. 6 *IEG*, Soph. F 682, Eur. F 1056, [Epicharmus] fr. 269 *PCG.*

F 14

[Stobaeus's text is unmetrical. Mekler's simple correction is preferable to the rewriting offered in Snell's note (πολλάκις σῴζουσιν αἱ συμβουλίαι | γονέων τὰ τέκνα). **ἔσωσαν** was probably a gnomic aorist, but the sentence might have been fuller, e.g. 'Parents' counsels have often saved their children'.**]**

F 15

The excerpt is concisely phrased but hardly incomprehensible (Hense) or corrupt (Snell). In fifth/fourth-century literature προστάται are usually political/military leaders. For **προστάταισι χρωμένην ἀναξίοις**, 'using unworthy leaders', cf. LSJ 'χράω' C.IV and e.g. Aristoph. *Eccl.* 176f. ὁρῶ γὰρ αὐτὴν προστάταισι χρωμένην | ἀεὶ πονηροῖς, 'I see her (our city) continually using corrupt leaders', Isocr. 12.151, Demosth. 3.27, Aeschin. 3.154. Xenophon states that 'those governed generally become like their leaders' (ὁποῖοί τινες γὰρ ἂν οἱ προστάται ὦσι, τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ ὑπ' αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ γίγνονται, *Cyrop.* 8.8.5 ≈ *Vect.* 1.1). The sense here, then, is that men who follow unworthy (ignoble) leaders cannot claim to be noble themselves, even if they are of noble birth. For the distinction between nobility of birth (*eugeneia* in its literal sense) and moral nobility see Astydamas **F 8** n. The criticism was presumably addressed to someone who had betrayed or risked betraying his noble status by following the instructions of an ignoble leader (or leaders). Pacelli (218–20) suggests that the speaker was Philoctetes trying to persuade Neoptolemus to defy Odysseus and the Atreidai in Theodectas's *Philoctetes*, noting the terms εὐγενής and ἀνάξιος in contrasts beween Neoptolemus and the Greek leaders in Soph. *Phil.* 439ff., 872ff., 1006ff.

F 16

Another rendering of a well-worn thought. πολυσπερής is an epic word referring to humans (*Iliad* 2.804, *Odyssey* 11.365) or Oceanids (Hes. *Theog.* 365); also to fish, Empedocles B 74 DK. The sentence is perilously near to Housman's parody, 'In speculation | I would not willingly acquire a name | for ill-digested thought; | but after pondering much, | to this conclusion I at last have come: | LIFE IS UNCERTAIN'.

F 17

From Strabo's geographical survey of India, which includes comparisons with Egypt and Ethiopia. **Onesicritus** of Astypalaea (*FGrH* 134) was Alexander the Great's chief helmsman on his eastern campaigns and wrote a somewhat fanciful account of Alexander's career and the lands he encountered. His work has been compared with Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*. Thirty-nine excerpts are quoted by Strabo, the elder Pliny, Plutarch, Arrian and others.

The name Aithiopes, **Ethiopians** probably meant 'burnt-faced' (αἰθι-οπες) and certainly had that connotation; their black skin and fuzzy hair were commonly thought to be caused by the heat of the Sun passing close to them after rising in the east (»» Snowden 1970, 2–5 with refs. in n. 6, 174f.; S. West on *Odyssey* 1.22–4, Diggle on Eur. *Phaethon* 1–4). That Theodectas's verses come from a play about the Ethiopian Memnon, who was slain by Achilles in the epic *Aethiopis*, is only a guess (e.g. Welcker 1841, 1078f.).

The excerpt is meticulously phrased. The aorist tenses are generalizing with no specific time-reference, the compound **ἐξέχρωσε** (< ἐκχρώζω/ἐκχρώννυμι) is found only here. **colours men's bodies etc.:** lit. 'colours ('stains') a murky smoke-bloom into men's bodies'. For **ἄνθος, bloom** denoting skin-colour cf. Solon fr. 27.6 *IEG* and especially [Aesch.] *PV* 22f. σταθευτὸς δ' ἡλίου φοίβῃ φλογὶ | χροίας ἀμείψεις ἄνθος, 'stationed in the Sun's bright flame you will change the colour of your skin' (imitated in *TrGF* adesp. F 161 χρόαν δὲ τὴν σὴν ἥλιος λάμπων φλογί | αἰγυπτίωσει, 'the Sun gleaming with flame will egyptianize your skin').[24] See also Chaeremon **F 12** with note.

F 18

Quoted by Athenaeus (**T 10**) before **F 4** without naming a play or mentioning tragedy. This seems to imply that **F 18** is not from *Oedipus*, and Xanthakis-Karamanos (1980, 99f.) argues that it was not from a play at all. The fragment is however assigned to *Oedipus* with some plausibility by Monda 2000, 30ff. after e.g. Methner 1882, 8, Del Grande 1933–34, 197, cf. Pacelli 131–35. Monda suggests that Athenaeus may have quoted Hermippus only as far as **F 18**, not realising it was from *Oedipus* because Hermippus did not say so, and added **F 4** with its identification from another riddle collection such as that of Clearchus.

[24] Or possibly anticipated if this is from *Prometheus Firebringer* (West 1979, 134), but the phrasing is perhaps too similar for that.

APHAREUS
(*TrGF* 73)

Testimonia. TrGF 1[2].238f.

Nothing survives from his plays, but the details of Aphareus's life and career are of some interest. He was the youngest son of Hippias of Elis, the famous sophist and polymath (Diels-Kranz no. 86) who is now known chiefly from the Platonic dialogues Protagoras*,* Hippias Major *and* Hippias Minor. *When Hippias died, probably in the 390s, his widow Plathane married Isocrates, who was by then over forty, and brought her three sons to Athens. Aphareus like Theodectas and Isocrates of Apollonia (Theodectas* ***T 8*** *with note) practised as both rhetor and tragedian. Isocrates in due course adopted him as his own son and heir. This information comes mainly from the biography of Isocrates in [Plutarch],* Lives of the Ten Orators *(**T 2**).*[1]

The biography provides details of Aphareus's dramatic career, which ran from 368 to 341 and included six productions with two victories at the City Dionysia and two productions at the Lenaea (see note 4 below). The Victors Lists inscription confirms the two Dionysia victories and places the first one a few years after Astydamas II's first victory in 372, with Theodectas's first victory intervening (DID A 3a.44–46). The only surviving fragment of the Didascaliae inscription relating to the Dionysia (DID A 2a) happens to include his last production in 341 which comprised Peliades*,* Orestes *and* Auge *(all Euripidean titles) and was placed third after Astydamas II and Euaretus.*[2] *It is notable that he had his plays produced by a theatrical professional rather than directing them himself (**T 2** at end).*

---

[1] Brief references also in the Suda (*TrGF* **T 1**), Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Harpocration (both T 3). The biography adds that Aphareus represented Isocrates successfully in one of the three antidoses that Isocrates challenged ([Plut.] *Mor.* 838a, 839c, cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dinarchus* 13). Aphareus is mentioned in two contemporary speeches (cf. T 6), [Dem.] 47.31f. and 52.14 (the second by Apollodorus).

[2] Euaretus (*TrGF* no. 85) is known only from this fragment of the Didascaliae inscription, which adds that he came third after Astydamas and Timocles in 340.

T 1 Suda *a* 4556

Ἀφαρεύς, Ἀθηναῖος, ῥήτωρ, υἱὸς τοῦ σοφιστοῦ Ἱππίου καὶ Πλαθάνης, πρόγονος δὲ Ἰσοκράτους τοῦ ῥήτορος, ἀκμάσας κατὰ τὴν ρε΄ Ὀλυμπιάδα, ὅτε καὶ Πλάτων ὁ φιλόσοφος.

T 2 [Plutarch], *Moralia* 838a–839d

(838a) ἐγένετο δ' αὐτῷ καὶ παῖς Ἀφαρεὺς πρεσβύτῃ ὄντι ἐκ Πλαθάνης τῆς Ἱππίου τοῦ ῥήτορος ποιητός, τῶν δὲ τῆς γυναικὸς τριῶν παίδων ὁ νεώτατος.

(838b–c) συνέγραψε δ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ παῖς Ἀφαρεὺς λόγους. ἐτάφη δὲ μετὰ τῆς συγγενείας πλησίον Κυνοσάργους ἐπὶ τοῦ λόφου ⟨ἐν⟩ ἀριστερᾷ αὐτός τε καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ Θεόδωρος καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ ὁ ποιητὸς υἱὸς Ἀφαρεὺς . . . καὶ οἱ υἱωνοὶ ⟨αὐτοῦ⟩, τοῦ ποιηθέντος αὐτῷ παιδὸς Ἀφαρέως, ἥ τε γυνὴ Πλαθάνη, μήτηρ δὲ τοῦ ποιητοῦ Ἀφαρέως.

(839b) καὶ νέον μὲν ὄντα μὴ γῆμαι, γηράσαντα δ' ἑταίρᾳ συνεῖναι ᾗ ὄνομα ἦν Λαγίσκη, ἐξ ἧς ἔσχε θυγάτριον ὃ γενόμενον ἐτῶν δώδεκα πρὸ γάμων ἐτελεύτησεν. ἔπειτα Πλαθάνην τὴν Ἱππίου τοῦ ῥήτορος γυναῖκα ἠγάγετο τρεῖς παῖδας ἔχουσαν, ὧν τὸν Ἀφαρέα ὡς προείρηται ἐποιήσατο, ὃς καὶ εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ χαλκῆν ἀνέθηκε πρὸς τῷ Ὀλυμπιείῳ ἐπὶ κίονος καὶ ἐπέγραψεν·

> Ἰσοκράτους Ἀφαρεὺς πατρὸς εἰκόνα τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε
> Ζηνί, θεούς τε σέβων καὶ γονέων ἀρετήν.

(839c–d) ὁ δ' Ἀφαρεὺς συνέγραψε μὲν λόγους, οὐ πολλοὺς δέ, δικανικούς τε καὶ συμβουλευτικούς· ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ τραγῳδίας περὶ ἑπτὰ καὶ τριάκοντα, ὧν ἀντιλέγονται δύο. ἀρξάμενος δ' ἀπὸ Λυσιστράτου διδάσκειν ἄχρι Σωσιγένους ἐν ἔτεσιν εἰκοσιοκτὼ διδασκαλίας ἀστικὰς καθῆκεν ἓξ καὶ δὶς ἐνίκησε διὰ Διονυσίου, καθεὶς καὶ δι' ἑτέρων ἑτέρας δύο Ληναϊκάς.

T 1 Suda

Aphareus, Athenian, orator, son of the sophist Hippias and Plathane, stepson of the orator Isocrates; in his prime in the 95th Olympiad (396/5–393/2 BC) along with the philosopher Plato.[3]

T 2 [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators, 'Isocrates'*

(838a) He (Isocrates) also had a son Aphareus, whom he adopted when he was an old man. His mother was Plathane, wife of the orator Hippias, and he was the youngest of her three sons.

(838b–c) His son Aphareus also composed speeches. And he (Isocrates) was buried with his family near Cynosarges, on the left flank of the hill, he and his father Theodorus and his mother . . . and his adopted son Aphareus . . . and his grandsons, sons of his adopted son Aphareus . . . and his wife Plathane, mother of the adopted Aphareus.

(839b) He (Isocrates) did not marry when he was young, but on reaching old age he lived with a companion named Lagisce and with her had a little daughter who died unmarried at the age of twelve. Then he took as his wife Plathane, wife of the orator Hippias, who had three sons, and of these he adopted Aphareus as has already been stated. Aphareus set up a bronze image of him on a column near the Temple of Olympian Zeus and added this inscription:

> Aphareus dedicated this image of Isocrates his father to Zeus, in reverence for the gods and for his parents' virtue.

(839c–d) Aphareus composed speeches, though not many, both forensic and deliberative. He also composed some thirty-seven tragedies, of which two are of disputed authorship. In the twenty-eight years from the archonship of Lysistratus (369/8) to that of Sosigenes (342/1) he presented six City productions and won twice through Dionysius, presenting also two Lenaean ones through others.[4]

---

[3] A chronological error: see above, p. 169.

[4] Dionysius and 'others' were presumably professional directors and chorus-trainers commissioned by the poet (cf. Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 90f.). Dionysius is not otherwise known (cf. Stephanis no. 712). The last phrase refers to Lenaean productions, not victories as e.g. Hoffmann (1951, 195), Pickard-Cambridge (84) and Snell in *TrGF* 73 T 5 suppose. Six productions at the Dionysia and two at the Lenaea amount to twenty-two tragedies (plus satyr-plays at the Dionysia to the extent that these were required during Aphareus's career: cf. above, p. 131 n. 4). The rest of the 'thirty-seven tragedies' may have been produced at deme festivals.

DIONYSIUS OF SYRACUSE
(*TrGF* 76)

Texts etc. TrGF 1[2].240–46 with *addenda* 1[2].354f., 5.1112f.; *MusTr* 180–89, 292f.

Discussions. Zuretti 1897; Olivieri 1950; Webster 1954, 298; Suess 1966; Simon 1982; Bosher 2006, 138–44; 2021, 181–87, 193–95; Duncan 2012; Monoson 2012; Wright 2016a, 130–43; Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 59f.; *SEHT* II.297, 301f.

Satyr-play, *Limos* (*Hunger*). Suess 1966, 301; *GrSat* 591f.; Cipolla 2003, 274, 284f., 302f.

Historical studies. Stroheker 1958; Sanders 1987; Caven 1990; Lewis 1994.

Dionysius was born into an influential family in Syracuse about 430, seized power there in 406/5 and governed as sole ruler until his death in 367. His political and military career was marked by the expansion of Syracusan power, a series of conflicts with Carthage for control of Sicily, intrusions into southern Italy and interventions in the politics of mainland Greece. He also established himself as a patron of religious and civic culture and the arts, including the theatre which provided him with a valuable means of political communication and self-display.[1] *Dionysius was himself active as a poet at least in his later years. Despite his achievements he was remembered mainly as a cruel and capricious tyrant in historical and anecdotal traditions shaped by hostile political and philosophical critics. His literary reputation was no doubt coloured by these traditions as well as by contemporary reactions, so it is difficult to evaluate the little available information on his accomplishments as a dramatist.*[2]

*We have titles of three tragedies with one text-fragment each (*Adonis, Alcmene, Leda*) and a fourth with some contextual information (*The Ransoming of Hector*). The satyr-play* Limos/Hunger *is known from a single reference which mentions a role for Heracles. Tzetzes'*

[1] For the physical development of the great theatre at Syracuse under Dionysius see *SEHT II*, 278f., 301f.

[2] See **T 1** and notes below on **[F 9], F 10?, F 11?**. Dionysius's reputation in antiquity and its sources are discussed and variously interpreted by Stroheker 11–31, Sanders 1–29, Caven 222–33; cf. Duncan 2012, 138–41 (the anecdotal tradition), Monoson 2012 (Plato).

*assertion that Dionysius wrote a play 'against Plato, more comic than proper to tragedy' (**T 3**) is not credible (see **F 11?** n.). According to Diodorus he did compose other kinds of poetry (**T 1** with note), and a reference to his paeans survives,*[3] *but he probably did not compose comedies and historical works as stated in the Suda (**T 2** with note).*

The only play of Dionysius that can be dated is The Ransoming of Hector *(**F 2a–b**), which won the prize at the Athenian Lenaea of 367 shortly before his death (Tzetzes, **T 3** with Diodorus, **T 1**); it was presumably accompanied by a second tragedy, now unidentified.*[4] *Tzetzes says that Dionysius 'recited many tragedies in Athens and came second or third' before this victory, but his whole statement is full of inaccuracies and this detail is implausible. Syracuse generally supported Sparta and was more or less hostile to Athens throughout the 380s and 370s until the crushing defeat of Sparta by Thebes and its allies at Leuctra in 371 forced a rapprochement between Athens and both Sparta and Syracuse. Dionysius and his sons were honoured at Athens and given Athenian citizenship in the summer of 368, and a defensive alliance between the two states was negotiated (though perhaps never ratified at Syracuse) about the same time.*[5] *Before then Dionysius would hardly have been a welcome applicant for a chorus at an Athenian dramatic festival, and it is reasonable to assume that politics played a part in his admission to the Lenaea of 367.*[6] *His other tragedies are more likely to have been produced at Syracuse than anywhere else.*

TrGF *prints eleven text-fragments and eleven isolated words (**F 12**), but two of the fragments probably belong to the fourth-century comic*

---

[3] Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 32 from Athenaeus 6.250b: see Dionysius T 8 in *TrGF*.

[4] Poets at the Lenaea normally presented two tragedies each and certainly did so at the Lenaea of 364 and 363 (DID A 2b.86–104 in *TrGF* 1^2.341 with 5.1115; Millis–Olson 2012, 120). Dionysius must have employed a professional director for this production (cf. Aphareus **T 2** with n. 4), and Diodorus's anecdote implies that he provided his own chorus,

[5] See e.g. Caven 1990, 208–12; Lewis 1994, 149–51.

[6] Caven 1990, 240 argues that the Lenaea production of 367 must have been his only production at Athens. Hoffmann (1951, 198–202) favoured adding 368 since Eubulus's *Dionysius* (below, p. 197) appears to have been produced before Dionysius's death and to have mocked his poetry, which must then have been familiar to Eubulus's audience. But Dionysius's poetry had been notorious since the 380s, and that may have been enough for Eubulus.

*poet Dionysius (**[F 7]**, **[F 8]**), two more may do so (**F 5**?, **F 6**?), and at least one more is probably inauthentic (**[F 9]**, also **F 10**?). **F 2–8** are all trite sententious statements quoted in anthologies and even if authentic tell us nothing about their author's dramaturgy. The three verses quoted by Lucian (**F [9]–F 11?**) were probably also preserved in isolation and are similarly unhelpful. The remaining fragments hint at a taste for verbal invention (**F 12**) and elaborate descriptions (**F 1**, **F 13**) in the manner of his contemporaries Carcinus (**F 5**) and Chaeremon (**F 1**, **F 14**). Trag-*

T 1 Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica*

(a) 15.6.1 κατὰ δὲ τὴν Σικελίαν Διονύσιος ὁ τῶν Συρακοσίων τύραννος ἀπολελυμένος τῶν πρὸς Καρχηδονίους πολέμων πολλὴν εἰρήνην καὶ σχολὴν εἶχεν. διὸ καὶ ποιήματα γράφειν ὑπεστήσατο μετὰ πολλῆς σπουδῆς, καὶ τοὺς ἐν τούτοις δόξαν ἔχοντας μετεπέμπετο καὶ προτιμῶν αὐτοὺς συνδιέτριβε καὶ τῶν ποιημάτων ἐπιστάτας καὶ διορθωτὰς εἶχεν . . .

(b) 15.73.5 μετ᾽ ὀλίγον δὲ χρόνον Διονύσιος εἰς ἀρρωστίαν ἐμπεσὼν ἐτελεύτησε, δυναστεύσας ἔτη τριάκοντα καὶ ὀκτώ . . . (74.1) . . . Διονυσίου τοίνυν δεδιδαχότος Ἀθήνησι Ληναίοις τραγῳδίαν καὶ νικήσαντος, τῶν ἐν τῷ χορῷ τις ᾀδόντων ὑπολαβὼν τιμηθήσεσθαι λαμπρῶς, ἐὰν πρῶτος ἀπαγγείλῃ τὴν νίκην, ἔπλευσεν εἰς τὴν Κόρινθον, καταλαβὼν δ᾽ ἐκεῖ ναῦν ἐκπλέουσαν εἰς Σικελίαν καὶ μετεμβὰς εἰς ταύτην, οὐρίοις ἐχρήσατο πνεύμασι, καὶ καταπλεύσας εἰς Συρακούσας συντόμως ἀπήγγειλε τῷ τυράννῳ τὴν νίκην. (2) ὁ δὲ Διονύσιος τοῦτον μὲν ἐτίμησεν, αὐτὸς δὲ περιχαρ�ὴς ἐγένετο καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς εὐαγγέλια θύσας πότους καὶ μεγάλας εὐωχίας ἐπετέλεσεν. ἑστιῶν δὲ λαμπρῶς τοὺς φίλους, καὶ κατὰ τοὺς πότους φιλοτιμότερον τῇ μέθῃ δοὺς ἑαυτόν, εἰς ἀρρωστίαν σφοδροτέραν ἐνέπεσε διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐμφορηθέντων ὑγρῶν. (3) ἔχων δὲ παρὰ θεῶν λόγιον, τότε τελευτήσειν ὅταν τῶν κρειττόνων περιγένηται, τὸν χρησμὸν ἀνέφερεν ἐπὶ τοὺς Καρχηδονίους, ὑπολαμβάνων τούτους κρείττους ἑαυτοῦ εἶναι. διὸ καὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς πλεονάκις πεπολεμηκὼς εἰώθει κατὰ τὰς νίκας ὑποφεύγειν καὶ ἑκουσίως ἡττᾶσθαι, ἵνα μὴ δόξῃ τῶν ἰσχυροτέρων γεγονέναι κρείττων. (4) οὐ μὴν ἠδυνήθη γε τῇ πανουργίᾳ κατασοφίσασθαι τὴν ἐκ τῆς πεπρωμένης ἀνάγκην, ἀλλὰ ποιητὴς ὢν κακὸς καὶ διακριθεὶς ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐνίκησε τοὺς κρείττονας ποιητάς.

edies such as Alcmene *and* Leda *could have included humorous elements, but there were precedents for this in Euripides (*Alcmene, Helen, Orestes *as well as the prosatyric* Alcestis*). Simon's suggestion (apropos* Adonis*) that he was a pioneer of the burlesque tragedy (*hilarotragoidia*) known from the later fourth century is speculative and seems inconsistent with the ancient accounts of his seriousness as a tragedian and his emulation of Aeschylus and Euripides.*

T 1 Diodorus of Sicily, *Library of History*

(a) (386/5 BC) In Sicily Dionysius the tyrant of Syracuse was now free from his wars against the Carthaginians and had an abundance of peace and leisure. So he took up writing poems with much diligence, and sent for those who were famous in this field, giving them preferment and spending time with them, and using them as supervisors and correctors of his own poems . . . *(anecdotes about D.'s mistreatment of Philoxenus (15.6.2–5) and Plato (15.7.1), a disastrous performance of his poetry at the Olympic Games (15.7.2) and his paranoid reactions (15.7.3–4)* . . . .

(b) (368/7 BC) A little later (i.e. after a campaign against the Carthaginians in Sicily) Dionysius fell ill and died, having ruled for thirty-eight years . . . (74.1) . . . Dionysius had presented a tragedy in Athens at the Lenaea and had won the prize. One of the men who sang in the chorus thought he would be splendidly honoured if he was the first to report the victory, so he sailed to Corinth, found a ship sailing for Sicily, and boarded it. With favourable winds he reached Syracuse and promptly reported the victory to the tyrant. (2) Dionysius rewarded him with honours and was himself overjoyed, made sacrifices to the gods for the good news, and organized drinking bouts and great feasting. He entertained his friends magnificently and gave himself up to intoxication rather competitively in the drinking bouts, and so fell into a rather severe illness because of the quantity of the liquids he had imbibed. (3) He had an oracle from the gods which said he would die when he overcame his superiors, and he always referred the oracle to the Carthaginians, supposing them to be stronger than himself. For that reason, though he often campaigned against them, he used to retreat at the moment of victory and willingly accept defeat, so that he would not seem to have overcome those who were stronger. (4) This infamous behaviour did not however enable him to outwit the necessity imposed by destiny. A bad poet and judged in Athens, he defeated his superiors in poetry.

T 2 Suda δ 1178

Διουνύσιος· Σικελίας τύραννος· ἔγραψε τραγῳδίας καὶ κωμῳδίας καὶ ἱστορικά. ὅτι καὶ ἕτεροι ἐτυράννησαν, ἀλλ' ἡ τελευταία καὶ μεγίστη κάκωσις πάσαις ταῖς πόλεσιν ἡ Διονυσίου τυραννὶς ἐγένετο.

T 3 Ioannes Tzetzes, *Historiae ('Chiliades')* 5.23.178–85

οὗτος ὁ Διονύσιος πολλὰς μὲν τραγῳδίας
ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις ἀναγνούς, δεύτερος, τρίτος ἦλθεν.
εἰς Λύτρα δὲ τοῦ Ἕκτορος καλούμενόν τι δρᾶμα
ἀναγνωσθὲν ἐνίκησε πάντας ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις.
ἐν δὲ τῷ κατὰ Πλάτωνος δράματι γεγραμμένῳ,
πλέον κωμικωτέρῳ μὲν ἢ τραγῳδίας ὄντι,
δοκῶ τὸν στίχον ἔλεξεν ὃς τῇ ἀρχῇ ἐγράφη·
αὐτοῖς γὰρ ἐμπαίζουσιν οἱ μωροὶ βροτῶν.

T 4 *See Antiphon* **T 1, T 3, T 7** *with p. 11 above.*

T 5 Athenaeus 11.482d

καὶ Ἔφιππος ἐν Ὁμοίοις ἢ Ὀβελιαφόροις

Διονυσίου δὲ δράματ' ἐκμαθεῖν δέοι . . .

T 11 *See* **F 9–11**.

ΑΔΩΝΙΣ

Suess 1966, 312–16; Simon 1982; *MusTr* 292f. n. 7. Myth and iconography: Atallah 1966, 53–91; *LIMC* I, 'Adonis'; Gantz 1993, 102f., 729–31.

A tragedy about Adonis is likely to have been about his death, gored by a boar while hunting. This fits well with ***F 1****, our only evidence for the play, insofar as it can be understood. The story commonly involved Aphrodite's love for Adonis and her grief at his death (notably Bion's* Lament for Adonis *and Ovid,* Met*. 10. 503–59, 708–39, cf. Sappho fr. 140 L–P, Theocritus 3.46–48, Apollodorus 3.14.4), but there were other elements and variants, so it is not possible to say what shape Dionysius might have given it. Nothing supports the suggestions that it was a 'cheerful tragedy' (*hilarotragoidia*, Simon 481f.) or a satyr-play.*[7]

[7] Steffen included it in his edition of the satyric fragments (1952, 250) but later accepted that it was more likely a tragedy (1979, 79).

T 2 Suda

Dionysius: tyrant of Sicily; he wrote tragedies and comedies and historical works. (It is recorded) that others also ruled as tyrants, but that Dionysius's tyranny was the most complete and greatest disaster for all the cities (of Sicily).

T 3 John Tzetzes, *Histories*

> This Dionysius recited many tragedies in Athens and came second or third, but in a play that was recited called *The Ransoming of Hector* he defeated all the poets in Athens. And in the play that he wrote against Plato, more comic than proper to tragedy, I suppose he spoke the verse that was written at the beginning (i.e. in the title of Tzetzes' story): *Those amongst men who are fools make fun of themselves* (**F 11?**).

T 4 *See opposite.*

T 5 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*

And Ephippus in *Lookalikes or Loafbearers* (fr. 16.1 *PCG*),

> And may I be obliged to learn Dionysius's plays by heart . . .

T 11 *See* **F 9–11**.

ADONIS

Simon also suggested that this play is reflected in two fourth-century vases. One of them[8] *shows Hermes conversing with Persephone, perhaps telling her of Zeus's decision that she must share Adonis with Aphrodite; they are framed by eleven young male and female figures whom Simon identifies as attendants of Adonis, while on the neck of the vase Adonis rides in a chariot with Aphrodite and Eros. The second vase*[9] *shows Adonis reclining on a couch, surrounded by Artemis and eight other females whom Simon identifies as Adonis's mother Myrrha, her nurse*

[8] Apulian volute-crater (Baltimore 48.84), c. 320 BC: *LIMC* VIII (Suppl.), 'Persephone' no. 292.

[9] Apulian pelikê (Naples Mus. Naz. SA 702), c. 350 BC: *LIMC* I, 'Adonis' no. 5, 'Persephone' no. 289; Atallah 1966, 205–7. Two other vases show virtually the same scene (see *LIMC* 'Adonis' under no. 5).

and several nymphs; here the neck shows Persephone and Aphrodite pleading with Zeus for possession of Adonis. Simon inferred that these scenes were influenced by Dionysius's play and that the play featured a chorus of oriental nymphs, characters including Adonis, Myrrha and her nurse, a death-scene on stage (like those of Alcestis and Hippolytus in Euripides' plays), and possibly a scene of Zeus's adjudication (like that in Aeschylus's Psychostasia *or* Weighing of Souls*). These inferences are*

F 1 Athenaeus 9.401f

Διονύσιος δὲ ὁ τύραννος ἐν τῷ Ἀδώνιδι·

νυμφῶν ὑπὸ σπήλυγγα †τὸν† αὐτόστεγον
σύαγρον †ἐκβόλειον εὔθηρον κλύειν†
ὁπλάς τ' ἀπαρχὰς ἀκροθινιάζομαι.

1 τὴν Dindorf τόνδ' Kaibel τήνδ' Cropp 3 ὁπλάς τ' Haupt ᾧ πλεῖστ' Ath.

ΑΛΚΜΗΝΗ

The sole text-fragment offers no clues but the subject may have been Amphitryon's discovery of Alcmene's seduction by Zeus and the god's rescue of her from punishment, as in Euripides' Alcmene *(cf. on Ion's* Alcmene*, Vol. 1, p. 80f.).*

F 2 Stobaeus 4.34.29

Διονυσίου τυράννου Ἀλκμήνης·

εἰ δ' ἀξιοῖς σοι μηδὲν ἀλγεινόν ποτε
†μηδὲν† ἔσεσθαι, μακαρίως ἔχεις φρενῶν·
θεῶν γὰρ ἕξειν βίοτον, οὐ θνητῶν δοκεῖς.

however insecure at several points, and it is far from clear that the vase scenes reflect theatrical scenes at all.

Comedies with the title Adonis *are recorded for Plato (the comic poet) in the late fifth or early fourth century, and in the early to mid-fourth century for Antiphanes, Araros (a son of Aristophanes), Nicophon and Philiscus. Only a handful of fragments from the first three survive, nearly all lexical; the plots are all unknown.*[10] *The only other known tragedy is credited to Ptolemy IV of Egypt in the late third century (*TrGF *no. 119).*

F 1 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*

And Dionysius the tyrant in *Adonis*:

> Beneath *this?* nymphs' cave with its natural shelter . . . the boar . . . *(text corrupt)* . . . and I take the hooves as a choice first offering.

ALCMENE

F 2 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On life's being short and cheap and full of cares'

From Dionysius the tyrant's *Alcmene*:

> If you expect that nothing will ever be painful for you, you're in a blessed state of mind; you expect to have a life of gods, not one of mortals.

[10] Araros F 1, ὁ γὰρ θεὸς τὸ ῥύγχος εἰς ἡμᾶς στρέφει, 'The god is turning his snout towards us', has sometimes been connected with a story found in Schol. Lycophron 831, Nonnus *Dionysiaca* 41.204–11 and other late sources, that Ares took the form of a boar in order to kill Adonis because he was jealous of Aphrodite's love for him. The story is unlikely to have originated in the fourth century, and in any case Athenaeus quotes the verse to show that the word ῥύγχος could refer to a human being's nose (or in this case a god's).

ΕΚΤΟΡΟΣ ΛΥΤΡΑ

Bühler 1973; Papathomopoulos 1981; Grossardt 2005. Iconography: *LIMC* I.i.147–61, 'Achilleus: Hektors Lösung' (A. Kossatz-Deissmann); Tuna-Nörling 2001; Schwarz 2008.

For the title see the note on ***F 2b****. The play dramatized Priam's mission to ransom his son's body after Hector's death at the hands of Achilles, an episode famous from the conclusion of the* Iliad *and previously dramatized by Aeschylus in his* Phrygians or Ransoming of Hector*. No other Greek dramatizations are known.*[11] *Tzetzes is our only source for Dionysius's play, naming it as the one that earned him his victory at the Athenian Lenaea of 367 (****F 2a*** *=* ***T 3****; cf. Diodorus,* ***T 1****) and adding some detail in connection with his own poetic account of the episode (****F 2b****). Tzetzes' poem describes Priam walking pitifully towards the Greek camp, supported by his daughter Polyxena and accompanied by Hector's wife Andromache and their sons Astyanax and Laodamas, while Idaeus drives a mule-cart carrying the ransom (*Troy Poems *2.307–407). This differs from the* Iliad*'s narrative, in which Priam and Idaeus travel together on a horse-drawn wagon, unaccompanied except that the god Hermes escorts them safely through the Greek lines. Aeschylus's play was set outside Achilles' hut in the Greek camp and seems (like the* Iliad*) not to have included members of Priam's family. It did introduce a group of Trojan men (servants of Priam?) as the play's chorus, and it included an early scene in which Hermes announced the gods' will to Achilles. It might have brought the wagon bearing the ransom into the orchestra and carrying Hector's body away at the end, and it certainly added a spectacular weighing of Hector's body against the gold which constituted the ransom.*[12]

---

[11] Sophocles' *Phrygians* may have had the same subject but only five verses survive (F 724–725 *TrGF*); his *Priam*, known only from five lexicographic references (F 528a–532), may or may not have been the same play. In Latin, Ennius's *Hectoris Lutra (Ransoming of Hector*) was probably modelled on Aeschylus. Accius's *Epinausimache* (*Battle at the Ships*) seems to have extended as far as the ransoming (frs 17–18 Dangel), but in what form is unknown.

[12] On Aeschylus's play see Taplin 1977b, 430; Radt in *TrGF* 3 (1985), 364–70; Sommerstein 2008, 262–69 with select bibliography; 2010, 246–48.

THE RANSOMING OF HECTOR

In Tzetzes' narrative Priam on reaching Achilles' presence pleads briefly for the return of his son's body (328–36); then Andromache delivers a longer speech as her sons stand by weeping (343–63), and Achilles is almost overcome by pity for them (364–80). Polyxena then embraces Achilles' knees in supplication and appeals to him again, offering herself to him as a slave if he will give up the body (381–89). At last Achilles relents and shares a meal with the supplicants (391–94). He accepts the gold and silver which are part of the ransom but gives the remainder (unspecified by Tzetzes, fine clothing according to Dictys 3.27: see below) to Polyxena as a betrothal gift, unaware that both will die before their marriage (395–401). Some time later, Achilles goes to the temple of Apollo Thymbraeus near Troy expecting to complete the negotiation for Polyxena in return for abandoning the war and is treacherously murdered by Paris and Deiphobus (3.385–400). After Achilles' funeral Polyxena, who has been in love with him all along, kills herself at his tomb, 'as Flavius [i.e. Philostratus] says, though Euripides' account is different' (3.496–503: Tzetzes here follows the story of Polyxena's Liebestod *which Philostratus probably invented to replace the usual story that she was sacrificed to placate the ghost of Achilles:* Heroicus *51.1–6,* Life of Apollonius *4.16).*

Tzetzes' unHomeric account of the ransoming of Hector and Achilles' love for Polyxena leading to his death in the temple was widespread, with incidental variations, in the literature of the Roman and Byzantine periods. The earliest extant narrative is in the Journal of the Trojan War *by 'Dictys of Crete' (a fictitious witness) written in the late first or early second century AD but now known mainly through a fourth-century Latin translation.*[13] *Dictys's ransoming scene (3.21–27) is largely repro-*

[13] As it happens, the only extensive papyrus fragment of the Greek text (P. Tebt. 2.268, re-edited by Pellé 2015) includes the murder of Achilles in the temple and its aftermath. Dictys's narrative is reflected directly or indirectly in later historical works, especially those of John Malalas of Antioch (5th–6th C.), John of Antioch (6th–7th C.), and Georgios Kedrenos (11th C., derived from ps.-Symeon, 10th C.). On Dictys's work in general see Gainsford 2012 with a proposed stemma of the works derived from Dictys, p. 66. That Andromache and her sons accompanied Priam on his mission was mentioned in the fanciful *New History* of Ptolemy Chennus, a near-contemporary of Dictys whose relationship

duced in Tzetzes' poem, and the detail that Achilles first saw Polyxena and resolved to marry her on this occasion is found in Philostratus, Heroicus *51.4 (other accounts including Dictys's provide different occasions). Before Bühler's republication of Tzetzes' scholion (see* ***F 2b*** *with note)*[14] *it was generally supposed that this whole story was formulated in the Hellenistic period,*[15] *but the scholion suggests that the ransoming episode involving Hector's family was already featured in some form in Dionysius's tragedy. Tzetzes does not say this explicitly but his statement (****Dionysius . . . says that he came on foot . . . and others say the same as Dionysius****)*[16] *seems to imply it; it is unlikely that he would have cited Dionysius merely for the detail of Priam travelling on foot. The play's action would have featured his arrival at Achilles' hut rather than his actual journey. An arrival supported by Polyxena and accompanied by Andromache and her sons would have made a dramatic moment comparable with, say, the arrival of Oedipus and Antigone at Colonus at the beginning of Sophocles' play. It is possible, then, that the essentials of Tzetzes' episode were anticipated in Dionysius's play. Such an episode certainly offers scope for a rhetorically and theatrically memorable tragedy: the spectacle of the grieving Priam with his entourage and the offered ransom; the pleas of Priam, Andromache and Polyxena; Achilles' emotional reactions and final submission to pity; and his*

---

with him is uncertain (Ptolemy p. 39 Chatzis, from Photius's *Library* cod. 190, p. 151b37–39 Bekker). See also Philostratus cited above.

[14] The scholion was previously published (without its last few words) by ten Brink 1851, 226. His publication seems to have gone unnoticed and is not mentioned in the relevant note of Bühler (1973, 69 n. 2).

[15] It seems to be alluded to in Cassandra's prediction of the sacrifice of Polyxena in Lycophron, *Alexandra* 323f., σὲ δ' ὠμὰ πρὸς νυμφεῖα καὶ γαμηλίους | ἄξει θυηλὰς στυγνὸς Ἴφιδος λέων, 'And you (Polyxena) will Iphis's grim lion (Neoptolemus) lead to bitter nuptials and bridal sacrifice'; similarly *Anth.Pal.* 9.117.1 (Statilius Flaccus), πένθιμον . . . Πολυξείνης ὑμέναιον, 'Polyxena's mournful wedding'. See also Seneca, *Troades* 195f., 362–4, 941–4, 1132–36. These passages could refer only to Polyxena as Achilles' posthumous bride and not to any prior relationship between them (so e.g. Fantham 1982, 238 on Sen. *Tro.* 195), but Tzetzes' scholion and the vase-painting noted below make this less likely. Hornblower (2015, 9, 190) thinks of the epic *Iliou Persis* as a possible source.

[16] Papathomopoulos's reading, ' . . . and we (i.e. Tzetzes) state other things similarly to Dionysius', is unambiguous but less likely: see on **F 2b** below.

betrothal to Polyxena with a foreshadowing of its fatal consequences.[17] *All of this however depends on an optimistic interpretation of Tzetzes' information and on the reliability of his unknown source.*[18]

If this was the content of Dionysius's play it was not entirely new. A recently published early fifth-century Attic Black Figure vase shows Priam supplicating Achilles and attended by Hermes in a conventional style, but in this instance Hermes leads towards Achilles a young woman whom he holds by the wrist, a gesture which identifies her as a bride.[19] *The young woman must be Polyxena, whom Hermes here brings to the living Achilles just as he will later escort her to join the dead Achilles in the underworld. The vase strongly reinforces other evidence that the tradition of Achilles' passion for Polyxena and his demand for her as a bride was established in the archaic period, even though there are only slight traces of it in what remains of early Greek literature.*[20] *It also shows that their meeting during the ransom episode was a key feature of the early story in at least one version. On the other hand, there is only slight evidence for the inclusion of Andromache in any early version,*

---

[17] For the possible content of the tragedy see Bühler 1973, 75–77, Papathomopoulos 1981, 204 ('Suivant la mode dramatique de son époque qui aimait la rhétorique et le pathétique, Denys a accentué le rôle d'Andromaque et des Hectorides . . . , a farci sa pièce de discours, ajouté l'offre pathétique de Polyxène et changé l'implacable Achille en une figure larmoyante. Ce sont ces changements qui doivent avoir fait le succès de sa pièce'). Grossardt 2005 suggests implausibly that the plot extended to include the later negotiations over Achilles' marriage with Polyxena, his murder in the temple, and the ransoming of his body in exchange for the gold paid for Hector's body (cf. Lycophron, *Alexandra* 269–72 with Hornblower 2016, 180f. *ad loc.*)

[18] Bühler (1973, 78 with n. 39) notes a suggestion of K. Alpers that Tzetzes might have got his information from a complete text of Ptolemy Chennos, who might have cited a hypothesis of the play.

[19] The vase was discovered in 1989 and published by Tuna-Nörling 2001.

[20] See especially Robertson 1990, Tuna-Nörling 2001, Schwarz 2001. The evidence is helpfully summarized in Sommerstein–Fitzpatrick–Talboy 2006, 42–47 with reference to Sophocles' *Polyxena*. Gainsford overlooks the vase and Tzetzes' scholion in arguing that the romantic relationship between Achilles and Polyxena might have been invented by Dictys (Gainsford 2012, 65 n. 34, 68 with n. 44). The vase is also overlooked by those who suggest that Achilles' first sighting of Polyxena was included in the *Cypria*'s narrative of his killing of her brother Troilus, e.g. West 2013b, 242f.

and none for the inclusion of her sons,[21] *so if they were part of the play they could have been innovations by Dionysius.*

The identity of the play's chorus (cf. ***T 1(b)****) and its dramatic role are unknown: probably not Trojan men as in Aeschylus's play if the pathos of Priam and the family group was emphasized.*

F 2a = **T 3**.1–4

F 2b (*TrGF* 1[2], 354f.) Ioannes Tzetzes, *Carmina Iliaca* 2.309–19 with Schol. on 311, ed. Leone 1995 (cf. Bühler 1973, Papathomopoulos 1981)

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ γοόωντες ἔρκεα τάφρου ἔβησαν,
λαοὺς μὲν ποτὶ πύργους τρέψε βίη Πριάμοιο,
μοῦνον δ' Ἰδαῖον λάβεν, ἡμιόνων ἐλατῆρα.
ὃς δὲ γυιοτρομέων τε καρηβαρέων τε κάρηνον,
ἐν κονίῃ κεφαλὴν μεμορυγμένος εἵνεκα πένθους,
οἴκτρ' ὀλοφυρόμενος πεζῇ κατὰ οἶμον ἔβαινε.
τοῦ δὲ Πολυξείνη παῖς, ἀγλαὸν εἶδος ἔχουσα,
χεῖρ' ἔχε δεξιτερὴν καὶ ἐπωρθεύεσκε πορείην.
σὺν δέ οἱ Ἀνδρομάχη ἐπιέσπετο δακρυχέουσα,
νηπιάχους ἐρύουσα γοῶντας Ἕκτορος υἱάς,
δοιὼ ἀδελφεώ, Ἀστυάνακτά τε Λαόδαμόν τε.

319 Λαόδαμόν τε Tzetz. ms. A (-δάμον τε ms. H[mg]) Λαοδάμαντα ms. H, Bühler Λαοδάμαντά τε mss. BC (deleted in C)

— Schol. Tzetz.: *μοῦνον δ' Ἰδαῖον·* Ὅμηρος ἐπὶ ξυνωρίδος ἵππων τὸν Πρίαμόν φησιν ἀφικέσθαι πρὸς Ἀχιλέα μόνον μετὰ Ἰδαίου· Διονύσιος δὲ ὁ Σικελῶν τύραννος γράφων {Ἀνδρομάχην} δρᾶμα Ἕκτορος Λύτρα πεζόν φησιν ἀφικέσθαι κατὰ τὴν τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου ἔκθεσιν· καὶ ἕτεροι δὲ ὁμοίως τῷ Διονυσίῳ φασίν.

3 Ἀνδρομάχην (-μάχη ms. H) del. Bühler Ἀνδρομάχην ⟨ἢ⟩ ten Brink (1851), Papathomopoulos 4–5 ἕτερα . . . φᾱ́ Tzetz. ms. O (om. H) ἕτεροι . . . φασίν Bühler ἕτερα . . . φαμέν Papathomopoulos

[21] Andromache is doubtfully identified in a ransom scene on an Attic Black-figure lekythos from around 500 BC (Athens, Nat. Mus. CC 889: *LIMC* I, 'Achilleus' no. 643). The sons are never present in the early iconography.

F 2a = **T 3**.1–4

F 2b John Tzetzes, *Troy Poems*

> But when they came, wailing, to the barrier of the ditch, mighty Priam turned back the people towards the walls[310] and took with him only Idaeus, driver of mules. With trembling limbs, head drooping heavily and soiled with dust by reason of his grief, piteously lamenting he trudged along the path. Polyxena his daughter, noble in form,[315] held his right hand and helped to guide his progress. Andromache accompanied him, shedding tears, leading Hector's young sons, wailing, the two brothers Astyanax and Laodamus.

— Tzetzes' note on 311: *Only Idaeus*: Homer says that Priam came to Achilles on a horse-drawn carriage, alone with Idaeus; but Dionysius, tyrant of the Sicilians, writing a drama *The Ransoming of Hector*, says that he arrived on foot as is set out in this book (i.e. in Tzetzes' poem); and others say the same as Dionysius.

ΛΗΔΑ

The subject was probably the seduction of Tyndareus's wife Leda by Zeus and/or its aftermath, this being the only notable myth concerning her. In the most popular versions of the story Zeus visited Leda in the form of a swan and the resulting egg(s) produced Helen, one or both of the Dioscuri and even in some accounts Clytemnestra (there were many variants: »» Gantz 1993, 318–21). Leda *is unique as a tragic title and the story is not obviously tragic, but it might have been dramatized along similar lines to* Alcmene *(above, p. 178). The subjects of Leda*

F 3 Stobaeus 4.41.2

Διονυσίου τυράννου ἐκ Λήδας·

θνητῶν δὲ μηδεὶς μηδέν' ὄλβιόν ποτε
κρίνῃ, πρὶν αὐτὸν εὖ τελευτήσαντ' ἴδῃ·
ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ γὰρ τὸν θανόντ' ἐπαινέσαι.

INCERTAE FABULAE

F 4 Plutarch, *Moralia* 338b–c; also attributed to 'Dionysius the tyrant' in Stobaeus 4.8.8 ('Censure of tyranny') and Zenobius Athous 2.55.

ὁ δὲ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ τῶν μὲν πολιτῶν μυρίους ἢ καὶ πλείους ἀνελών, προδοὺς δὲ τὸν ἀδελφὸν ὑπὸ φθόνου τοῖς πολεμίοις, οὐκ ἀναμείνας δὲ τὴν μητέρα γραῦν οὖσαν ὀλίγαις ἡμέραις ἀποθανεῖν ὕστερον ἀλλ' ἀποπνίξας, ἐν δὲ τραγῳδίᾳ γράψας αὐτός,

ἡ γὰρ τυραννὶς ἀδικίας μήτηρ ἔφυ,

ὅμως τῶν θυγατέρων τὴν μὲν Ἀρετὴν τὴν δὲ Σωφροσύνην ὠνόμασε, τὴν δὲ Δικαιοσύνην.

F 5? Theophilus of Antioch, *Discourse to Autolycus* 2.37.16–20; verses also attributed to 'Dionysius' in Stobaeus 1.3.19 ('On Justice instructed by God to watch over events on earth etc.').

καὶ ὅτι ὁ θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐφορᾷ καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτὸν λανθάνει, μακρόθυμος δὲ ὢν ἀνέχεται ἕως οὗ μέλλει κρίνειν, καὶ περὶ τούτου Διονύσιος εἴρηκεν·

ὁ τῆς Δίκης ὀφθαλμὸς ὡς δι' ἡσύχου
λεύσσων προσώπου πάνθ' ὅμως ἀεὶ βλέπει.

2 ὅμως Stob. ὁμῶς Theoph.

LEDA

*with the swan and with the resulting egg were popular in art of the late fifth and the fourth centuries (*LIMC *VI, 'Leda' nos 1–27, 28–32). Cratinus's comedy* Nemesis *(*431 BC?, *frs 114–127 PCG) exploited a version of the story in which Zeus mated with Nemesis and Leda hatched Helen from the egg which Nemesis produced.*[22] *In the fourth century Eubulus's* Laconians or Leda *(frs 60–63 PCG; Hunter 1983, 146–49) and Sophilos's* Tyndareus or Leda *(a title only) presumably used some form of the myth.*

F 3 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'That human prosperity is insecure etc.'

Dionysius the tyrant, from *Leda*:

> No one should judge that anyone is fortunate until he sees he has ended his life well. There's no risk in congratulating the dead.

UNIDENTIFIED PLAYS

F 4 Plutarch, *On the fortune or virtue of Alexander the Great*

But his (i.e. Dionysius II's) father, who killed ten thousand of his citizens or even more, who betrayed his brother to their enemies through envy, who strangled his own elderly mother rather than wait for her to die a few days later, and himself wrote in a tragedy,

> Tyranny is the mother of injustice,

nevertheless named one of his daughters Virtue, the next Temperance, and the third Righteousness.

F 5? Theophilus of Antioch, *Discourse to Autolycus*

And that God sees all and nothing escapes him, but being patient he tolerates it until he is ready to give judgment, Dionysius too has said about this:

> Be sure, the eye of Justice watches with calm countenance, yet always sees everything.

[22] Bakola 2010, 168–73 identifies some paratragic elements in Cratinus's comedy but doubts there was any specific tragic model.

F 6? Stobaeus 3.34.1 (and elsewhere without attribution)

Διονυσίου·

ἢ λέγε τι σιγῆς κρεῖσσον ἢ σιγὴν ἔχε.

[F 7] Stobaeus 3.38.2 (Dionysius com. fr. *7 *PCG*)

Διονυσίου·

ἔπειτα δ’ οὐδὲ τοῦτο γιγνώσκεις, ὅτι
τοῖς οὐδὲν οὖσιν οὐδὲ εἷς ὅλως φθονεῖ;

[F 8] Stobaeus 3.38.6 (and elsewhere without attribution: Dionysius com. fr. *8 *PCG*)

Διονυσίου·

αὐτὸς πενόμενος τοῖς ἔχουσι μὴ φθόνει.

αὐτὸς πενόμενος Boissonade λιτὸς γενόμενος Stob. (αὐτὸς πενωθείς Menand. *Monost.* 52 Jaekel = Pernigotti)

[F 9], **F 10?, F 11?** (with T 11) Lucian, *Adversus indoctum et libros multos ementem*, 15; **F 11?** also in Tzetzes, *Hist.* 5.23.182–85 (see **T 3** above) and *Epist.* 1, p. 4 Leone citing ‘Dionysius’s tragedy’.

λέγεται δὲ καὶ Διονύσιον τραγῳδίαν ποιεῖν φαύλως πάνυ καὶ γελοίως, ὥστε τὸν Φιλόξενον πολλάκις δι’ αὐτὴν εἰς τὰς λατομίας ἐμπεσεῖν οὐ δυνάμενον κατέχειν τὸν γέλωτα. οὗτος τοίνυν πυθόμενος ὡς ἐγγελᾶται, τὸ Αἰσχύλου πυξίον εἰς ὃ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραφε σὺν πολλῇ σπουδῇ κτησάμενος, αὐτὸς ᾤετο ἔνθεος ἔσεσθαι καὶ κάτοχος ἐκ τοῦ πυξίου· ἀλλ’ ὅμως ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκείνῳ μακρῷ γελοιότερα ἔγραφεν, οἷον κἀκεῖνο τὸ

†Δωρικὸν ἦκεν† ἡ Διονυσίου γυνή **[F 9]**

καὶ πάλιν

οἴμοι, γυναῖκα χρησίμην ἀπώλεσα **F 10?**

(καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ πυξίου) καὶ τό

αὐτοῖς γὰρ ἐμπαίζουσιν οἱ μωροὶ βροτῶν. **F 11?**

F 9 Δωρὶς τέθνηκεν C. F. Hermann Δωρίδιον ἦκεν Seiler

F 12 *Words used in novel senses by Dionysius (main sources below;* cf. *also Proclus on Plato’s* Cratylus, §85; *others elsewhere unattributed):*

a. βαλλάντιον b. ἑλκύδριον c. σκέπαρνον d. ἐριώλη e. θυέστης
f. μένανδρος g. μενεκράτης h. μυστήρια i. γαρότας k. ἴακχος
l(?). καρποτόκος (*or* καρπότεξ?)

F 6? Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On speaking appropriately'

Dionysius:

> Either say something better than silence, or keep silent.

[F 7] Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On envy'

Dionysius:

> And then, don't you recognize this either, that absolutely no one envies those who are nothing?

[F 8] Stobaeus 3.38.6

Dionysius:

> If you're poor yourself, don't envy those who aren't.

[F 9], **F 10?**, **F 11?** (with T 11) Lucian, *Against the uneducated man who buys a lot of books*; **F 11?** also quoted by Tzetzes, *Hist.* 5.23 (see **T 3** above) and *Epistle* 1.

It's said also that Dionysius composed tragedy quite poorly and laughably, so that Philoxenus was often thrown into the quarries because of it, being unable to contain his laughter. Now when Dionysius realized he was being laughed at, he went to great lengths to acquire the boxwood tablet on which Aeschylus used to write and thought that he himself would be inspired and possessed through the tablet's influence. On that very tablet, however, he wrote things that were far more laughable, such as the famous

> †*Doris(?)* . . . †, the wife of Dionysius **[F 9]**

and again

> O woe, a serviceable wife I've lost **F 10?**

(this too from the tablet), and

> Those amongst men who are fools make fun of themselves. **F 11?**

F 12 *Words used with novel meanings by Dionysius (normal meanings in parentheses; main sources below)*

a. javelin (purse) b. bucket (a slight sore) c. wool (adze) d. cloak (whirlwind) e. pestle (Thyestes) f. maiden (Menander) g. pillar (Menekrates) h. mouseholes (mysteries) i. ox (?) k. piglet (Iacchos, Iacchos-song) l(?). month (produce-bearing, i.e. interest-generating)

Helladius summarized in Photius, *Bibl.* 279, p. 532 Bekker

ὅτι παρὰ Εὐφορίωνι . . . κακοζήλους ἔστιν εὑρεῖν λέξεις . . . παρεζήλωσε δὲ τὸν πρῶτον Διονύσιον τὸν Σικελίας τύραννον, ὃς ὑπὸ τῆς ἐξουσίας καὶ τῶν κολάκων καὶ τῆς τρυφῆς διαφθειρόμενος ἐπεχείρησε καὶ τραγῳδίας γράφειν, ἐν αἷς καὶ τοιαῦτα συνεφόρησε ῥήματα, τὸ μὲν ἀκόντιον καλῶν **βαλάντιον**, τὸν δὲ κάδον **ἑλκύδριον**, **σκέπαρνον** δὲ τὸ ἔριον, τὴν δὲ χλαῖναν **ἐριώλην** οἷον ὅλεθρον οὖσαν τῶν ἐρίων, καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα καταγελαστά . . . Διονύσιος δὲ ὁ προειρημένος τύραννος **θυέστην** τὸν δοίδυκα ἐκάλει.

Athenaeus 3.98d

τοιοῦτοί τινές εἰσιν, ὦ ἑταῖροι, οἱ Οὐλπιάνειοι σοφισταί . . . πολλῶν ὀνομάτων ποιηταὶ καὶ πολλοῖς παρασάγγαις ὑπερδραμόντες τὸν Σικελιώτην Διονύσιον, ὃς τὴν μὲν παρθένον ἐκάλει **μέναδρον**, ὅτι μένει τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ τὸν στῦλον **μενεκράτην**, ὅτι μένει καὶ κρατεῖ, **βαλάντιον** δὲ τὸ ἀκόντιον, ὅτι ἐναντίον βάλλεται, καὶ τὰς τῶν μυῶν διεκδύσεις **μυστήρια** ἐκάλει, ὅτι τοὺς μῦς τηρεῖ. Ἄθανις δ᾽ ἐν α΄ Σικελικῶν τὸν αὐτόν φησι Διονύσιον καὶ τὸν βοῦν **γαρόταν** καλεῖν καὶ τὸν χοῖρον **ἴακχον**.

Socraticorum Epistulae 35 Hercher (33 Köhler)

πρῶτον μὲν οὖν συγχαίρω Συρακουσίοις ὅτι πέπαυνται τὸν χοῖρον **ἴακχον** καλοῦντες καὶ τὸν βοῦν **γαρόταν** καὶ **βαλλάντια** τὰ ἀκόντια, **καρποτόκον** τε μῆνα, ὅτι καρπὸς ἐν αὐτῷ γίνεται.

καρποτόκον Orelli καρπότοκα *Epist.* καρπότεκα Sykutris

F 13 Polybius 12.24.1–2 (= Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 152 and F 111)

ὅτι διαπορεῖν ἔστι περὶ τῆς αἱρέσεως Τιμαίου. φησὶ γὰρ τοὺς ποιητὰς καὶ συγγραφέας διὰ τῶν ὑπεράνω πλεονασμῶν ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι διαφαίνειν τὰς ἑαυτῶν φύσεις . . . τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐπὶ τοῦ Διονυσίου τοῦ τυράννου, κλινοκοσμοῦντος καὶ τὰς τῶν ὑφασμάτων ἰδιότητας καὶ ποικιλίας ἐξεργαζομένου συνεχῶς.

Helladius in Photius's summary

That in Euphorion . . . one can find unsuitable expressions . . . . He emulated Dionysius the First, tyrant of Sicily who, corrupted by power and flatterers and luxury, set about writing tragedies in which he assembled words of this kind, calling the javelin ***balantion***, the bucket ***helkudrion***,[23] wool ***skeparnon***,[24] the cloak ***eriôlê***, i.e. a wasting *(ol-)* of wool *(eri-)*, and many ridiculous things of this kind . . . . And Dionysius the aforesaid tyrant called the pestle ***thyestês***.[25]

Athenaeus

Such, my friends, are the sophists of Ulpian's type . . . makers of many words, outrunning by many parasangs the Sicilian Dionysius, who called the maiden ***menandros*** because she awaits *(men-)* the man *(andr-)*, the pillar ***menekratês*** because it stays put *(men-)* and has strength *(krat-)*, the javelin ***balantion*** because it is thrown *(bal-)* against *(anti-)*, and mouseholes ***mystêria*** because they protect *(têre-)* mice *(mûs)*. And Athanis in Book 1 of his *Sicilian History* says that the same Dionysius also called the ox ***gārotas***[26] and the piglet ***iacchos***.[27]

Socratic Letter

First of all I rejoice with the Syracusans that they have stopped callling the piglet ***iacchos*** and the ox ***gārotas*** and javelins ***ballantia***, and a month ***karpotokos*** because interest (*karpo-*) is generated *(tok-)* in it.[28]

F 13 Polybius, *Histories*

One may well have doubts about Timaeus's approach (i.e. to writing history). He says that poets and writers reveal their own natures in their writings through their excessive use of some topics . . . *(examples from Homer's preoccupation with feasting and Aristotle's with delicacies)* . . . . Similarly on the tyrant Dionysius, as he constantly prepares couches and works out the details and refinements of woven cloths.

---

[23] 'Because it draws *(helk-)* water *(hudr-)*', Schol. Dionys. Thrax p. 452.

[24] 'Because it covers *(skep-)* the sheep *(arn-)*', Schol. Dionys. Thrax *ibid*.

[25] Presumably 'mortar-implement' (θυεία 'mortar', the bowl in which materials are crushed with a pestle).

[26] Presumably 'earth-plower' *(gā-arotās)*: see **F 12** note.

[27] Explanation unknown: possibly identifying the Iacchos-cry of the Eleusinian Mysteries with the squealing of piglets sacrificed to Demeter (Suess 1966, 312).

[28] Interest on loans was usually paid monthly in the Greek and Roman world.

Notes on Dionysius of Syracuse

T 1

(a) Diodorus does not specify tragedies, but 'poems' probably includes them; we know of at least one tragedian in his entourage (the unfortunate Antiphon: above, p. 11). Similarly the 'poems' recited at the Olympic Games may have included tragic pieces. The chronology of the Olympic Games episode is confused. Diodorus relates it twice, first in 388 BC (14.109) when Dionysius was busy besieging Rhegium, and again (15.7.2) in 386 which was not an Olympic year. 388 is generally accepted but is questioned by Lewis 1994, 139 n. 82; he follows Grote in considering 384 more likely. The episode is also mentioned by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Lysias* 29f. quoting the begining of Lysias's otherwise lost Olympic oration (Lysias *Or.* 33).

(b) See above, p. 173 for the circumstances of Dionysius's Lenaea victory, and below on **T 3**. Pliny, *NH* 7.180 (= Dionysius T 9 in *TrGF*) alludes to the story that his death was due to the celebration. Plutarch, *Dion* 6 says only that he fell ill and cites Timaeus's claim (*FGrH* 566 F 109) that he was then poisoned in order to assure the succession of Dionysius II (cf. Nepos, *Dion* 2).

T 2

comedies and historical works: there is no other evidence for these assertions. Both are probably due to confusion with other authors of the same name, of whom there were many. For the comic poet Dionysius see below on **F 5?–[F 8]**. For what it is worth, Aelian *VH* 13.18 says that Dionysius was not interested in comedy (= Dionysius T 6 in *TrGF*).

T 3

Tzetzes here and in **F 2b** provides the only evidence for Dionysius's *Ransoming of Hector*, but some of his details are fanciful. That Dionysius **recited many tragedies in Athens and came second or third** before this success is historically improbable (see above, p. 173). He could only have come **third** at the Dionysia, and there is no reason to think that he competed there; nor did he defeat **all the poets in Athens** at the Lenaea. For **the play he wrote against Plato** see below on **F 11?**

T 5

The verse is quoted by Athenaeus in a discussion of the drinking cups known as *kumbia*. This and Eubulus's *Dionysius* (see below on **[F 9]–F 11?**) illustrate contemporary Athenian reactions to Dionysius's poetry. For the joke cf. Ar. *Knights* 401, 'may I be trained to sing in a tragedy of Morsimus'.

F 1

Athenaeus cites the verses as an example of the word σύαγρος meaning 'wild boar (σῦς ἄγριος).[29] The speaker, probably Adonis himself, describes how he makes an offering of a boar's hooves in thanks for a successful hunt (line 3), presumably to the nymphs whose cave is mentioned in line 1. The corrupt line 2 seems incurable, so the sense of the whole and its dramatic context remain uncertain. Something like the prologue-scene of Euripides' *Hippolytus* with Hippolytus's speech (*Hipp.* 73ff.) is possible.

1. *this?*: τήνδ' (THNΔΑYTO-) is perhaps more plausible than Dindorf's simple τὴν ('the'); the cave could then be the stage-set (*skênê*) and the context a prologue-speech or at least an early scene. **[**The word σπῆλυγξ is feminine, so Kaibel's τόνδ' is only possible if **αὐτόστεγον** is also corrupt. Roux's attempt to make **αὐτόστεγον** refer to the boar is impossible (see n. 30]).**]**

2. The text as it stands is meaningless, and attempts at restoration and interpretation soon take us into the realm of fantasy.[30] **ἐκβόλειον**, found only here, is presumably an adjective (the noun ἐκβολή means 'ejection', 'expulsion', 'dislocation', 'something cast out' etc.: »» LSJ, *DGE*). **εὔθηρον** should mean either 'good for hunting' (an area rich in wild beasts) or 'successful in the hunt' (cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 1253); the latter seems appropriate here.

3. Haupt's emendation **ὁπλάς τ'** for ms. ᾧ πλεῖστ' ('to which mostly') is very plausible. He noted the hunters' practice of dedicating an animal's head and/or feet to a deity such as Artemis or Pan after a successful hunt (Diodorus 4.22, Schol. Ar. *Plut.* 944, Rhianus *Anth.Pal.* 6.34). The verb **ἀκροθινιάζομαι** is found only here and in Eur. *HF* 476.

---

[29] For the formation of such words (ὄναγρος 'wild ass', βόαγρος 'wild ox' etc.) see Risch 1949, 286f.

[30] LSJ makes **ἐκβόλειον** a noun qualified by **σύαγρον**, hence 'a boar-expulsion', i.e. a sow's womb included with the hooves in the speaker's offering; but **σύαγρον** is cited as a noun by Athenaeus. Conjectures: σύαγρον μολεῖν ἔλειον εὔθηρον κλύω, 'I hear that a wild marsh-boar, good for hunting, has come' (Herwerden 1862, 77f., cf. Olivieri 1950, 91f.); σύαγρον, ἀκρόλειον (= ἀκροθίνιον) εὔθηρον, κλονῶ, 'I drive a boar, a successfully-hunted choice offering' (Haupt 1869, 141); . . . ἄγων αὐτόστεγον | σύαγρον τὸν ἐκβόλειον εὔθηρος κλύω, 'When I bring in . . . the self-covered (i.e. stout-hided) wild boar, the one that helped my birth (τὸν ἐκβόλειον!), I am (= 'will be') called a successful hunter' (Suess 1966, 313ff., cf. *MusTr* 185 with 292f. n. 7; misunderstood by Wright 2016a, 141). Roux 1967, 260ff. keeps the text virtually unchanged: someone has told the speaker that he hears (κλύειν) that the boar that shares their dwelling (τόν⟨δ⟩' αὐτόστεγον!), evades missiles (ἐκβόλειον!) and is a successful hunter (εὔθηρον), and to which he dedicates his most abundant first-fruits (i.e. it often ravages his vines etc.), has slipped into the nymphs' cave.

F 2

A reworking of one of the commonest themes in early Greek literature, often a consolation (»» Kassel 1958, 54–56). The collections in Stobaeus 4.34 (source of this fragment) and 4.39–44 are all concerned with human vulnerability to fortune and misfortune. For the contrast with the blessed life of gods see especially *Iliad* 24.525f., Aesch. *Ag.* 553f., Soph. F 946, Eur. F 1075. Note also **F 3.**

F 2b

For interpretation and discussion see the introduction to *The Ransoming of Hector* above, pp. 180–84. The text and sense of Tzetzes' scholion are a little uncertain. **Ἀνδρομάχην** should probably be deleted as suggested by Bühler (1973, 71–74) rather than retained as an alternative play-title (ten Brink 1851, 226, Papathomopoulos 1981, 201–3, Leone ed.). Bühler's arguments are not all compelling,[31] but it does seem unlikely that a tragedy about the ransoming of Hector would have been called *Andromache* even if her part was substantial, and even if this was only an alternative title.[32] **κατὰ τὴν τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου ἔκθεσιν** ('according to this book's exposition') refers to Tzetzes' own poem, not a hypothesis of Dionysius's play where Tzetzes might have found his information as argued by Papathomopoulos (1981, 205): see Leone 1992–93, 62. **καὶ ἕτεροι δὲ ὁμοίως τῷ Διονυσίῳ φασίν** (**and others say the same as Dionysius**): Papathomopoulos (1981, 204) retains ἕτερα and interprets ms. φᾱ΄ as φαμέν ('and we (= I) state other things similarly to Dionysius'), but Tzetzes' statement is focused on the literary antecedents and the authorities for his own account (**Ὅμηρος...Διονύσιος δὲ...καὶ ἕτεροι δὲ...**) and the reading φαμέν is unjustified.

[Papathomopoulos reads φᾱ΄ as φαμεν at Schol. *Hist.* 2.279 and 3.407 but Leone prints both as φασιν. Reading ἕτερα . . . φασίν ('they say other things similarly to Dionysius') is impossibly vague. In line 319 of the poem ms. A's **Λαόδαμον** is paralleled in Tzetzes *Theog*. 460–62 (Ἕκτωρ . . . γεννᾷ τὸν Ἀστυ-

[31] Bühler thought retention would require changing the word-order to δρᾶμα Ἀνδρομάχην ⟨ἢ⟩ Ἕκτορος Λύτρα since Tzetzes normally places the word δρᾶμα first in such citations; but note Tzetz. *Hist.* 4.13.964 Ῥήσῳ δράματι, 8.202.452 ἐν Αὐτολύκῳ δράματι σατυρικῷ, 10.329.364 ἐν τῷ Βατράχων δράματι, 5.23.180 (see **T 3** above), and in prose *Exeg.Iliad.* Prolog. 1025 ἐν ταῖς Τρῳάσιν οἶμαι τῷ δράματι. Even so, the phrasing Ἀνδρομάχην δρᾶμα ἢ Ἕκτορος Λύτρα would be peculiar.

[32] Such titles seem to have been supplied later by scholars, grammarians or booksellers: »» Hunter 1983, 146–8, Sommerstein 2002, 5–8. Sommerstein p. 9 mentions some Euripidean titles which accompanied innovative plots (*Andromache, Iphigenia (in Tauris), Helen, Melanippe (Desmotis), Hypsipyle*), but in each of these the heroine was the central figure in a way that Andromache could not have been in Dionysius's play.

ἄνακτα, Λαόδαμον σὺν τούτῳ). Λαοδάμαντα is the usual form but grammatically incorrect, Λαοδάμαντά τε grammatically correct but unmetrical.**]**

F 3

Like **F 2**, a reworking of a very common gnomic theme, e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 928, Soph. *Trach*. 1–3, Eur. *Hcld.* 856f., Hdt. 1.32.6f., 5.4. The advice was credited to two of the Seven Sages besides Herodotus's Solon: Chilon in 10 γ′ 7 DK and Periander in 10 ζ′ 11 DK. See also Astydamas **F 5** n.

F 4

Tyranny and injustice essentially connected, e.g. Soph. *OT* 873 (ὕβρις φυτεύει τύραννον); Eur. *Supp.* 429–37, *Pho.* 523–5, 549f., Pl. *Rep.* 344a, 567b7–9. The verse is hard to interpret without a dramatic context, but it may have been meant to enhance Dionysius's political image as the naming of his daughters clearly was.

F 5?, F 6?, [F 7], [F 8]

Ascriptions of these fragments are doubtful since their sources (Theophilus of Antioch [2nd C. AD] for **F 5?**, Stobaeus for all, both using anthologies) name only 'Dionysius', whereas the sources of **F 1–4** and **[F 9]–F 13** (including Stobaeus for **F 2–4**) clearly identify the Syracusan ruler ('Dionysius the tyrant' etc.). The simple 'Dionysius' might be the fourth-century comic poet, to whom six other excerpts are unambiguously ascribed (Dionysius com. frs 1–6 *PCG*). **F 5?** and **F 6?** are usually but uncertainly ascribed to the tragedian. **[F 7]** seems comic in style and **[F 8]** probably belongs with it (see notes below).

F 5?

For the all-seeing eye of justice see e.g. Soph. F 12, Eur. F 223.57f., F 255, F 555, and above on Theodectas **F 8**. **[yet always sees everything:** I prefer Stobaeus's **ὅμως** to Theophilus's ὁμῶς ('sees everything equally'), though that phrasing is idiomatic (LSJ 'ὁμῶς' I.2). The point then is that Justice seems to watch impassively yet notices everything and reacts sooner or later. M. L. West suggested πρόσωθεν . . . ὅμως (in *TrGF* 5, p. 1112), 'watches calmly from afar, yet always sees everything', but δι' ἡσύχου (adj.) meaning 'calmly' would be very unusual (cf. LSJ 'διά' III.i.b, *DGE* 'διά' B.III.2(c)), and Justice does not usually watch from a distance (cf. Eur. F 151, F 255, adesp. F 493).**]**

F 6?

A variant of a saying attributed to Pythagoras (Stobaeus 3.34.7), χρὴ σιγᾶν ἢ κρείσσονα σιγῆς λέγειν, 'one should keep silent or say things better than silence'. Cf. Eur. *Orestes* 638f., and more generally on the merits of silence Eur. F 977, Carcinus **F 7**, and others in Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 140.

[F 7]
The excerpt is combined with two other obviously separate ones in Stobaeus (3.38.2a, 2b = *TrGF* adesp. F 530, 531) and ascribed to 'Dionysius' (see above on **F 5?–[F 8]**). It is probably comic for four reasons: *(a)* the phrase **οὐδὲ εἷς** (with hiatus, **no one**, 'not a single one') is common in comedy but virtually unknown in tragedy (»» Moorhouse 1962, 246 and 1965, 33; the only other possible example, *TrGF* adesp. F 477 (Stob. 1.1.13f), is arbitrarily classified as tragic); *(b)* the colloquial **ὅλως** (**absolutely**, or with negative 'not at all') appears in tragedy just once (Chaeremon **F 30**) but is frequent in 4th-century comedy, e.g. Alexis frs 2.8, 222.9, Menand. *Aspis* 116, *Dysc.* 60, 613); *(c)* the exaggerated negatives οὐδὲ τοῦτο . . . τοῖς οὐδὲν . . . οὐδὲ εἷς seem comic in tone (cf. Magnes fr. 5 *PCG*, οὐκ ἔστιν (or οὔκ ἐστιν) οὐδεὶς οὐδ' ὁ Μυσῶν ἔσχατος, 'There's (*or* 'he's') nobody, not even the lowest of the Mysians'); *(d)* The nearest parallel is ps.-Epicharmus fr. 267 *PCG* (Stob. 3.38.21), esp. lines 2–3 δῆλον ὡς ἀνὴρ παρ' οὐδὲν ἐσθ' ὁ μὴ φθονούμενος. | τυφλὸν ἠλέησ' ἰδών τις, ἐφθόνησε δ' οὐδὲ εἷς, 'Clearly a man unenvied is next to nothing. People pity a blind man, but no one at all envies him'.

[F 8]
Again combined with an obviously separate item in Stobaeus (3.38.6a = *TrGF* adesp. F 533) and again probably comic. For the sentiment cf. Agathon **F 23** with note in Vol. 1; Stephanopoulos 1988b, 18 adds Isocrates 7.31f.

[F 9], F 10?, F 11?
Lucian's anecdote is largely fictitious or at best a distorted pastiche, but the verses he quotes have often been taken seriously and ascribed more or less confidently to plays of Dionysius.[33] Suess (1966, 302) suggested that Dionysius dramatized his wife's death and his own grief within a basically mythical plot. Xanthakis-Karamanos (1980, 152f.) thought in terms of a play dramatizing Doris's life and death (cf. *MusTr* 293 n. 10). Duncan (2012, 145–7) infers that Dionysius wrote historical tragedies dramatizing episodes from his own life and reign (cf. Wright 2016a, 140). This is all rather improbable. **[F 9]** refers to **the wife of Dionysius** and may have named Doris of Locri, one of the two wives whom he married in 396 (see below on the text),[34] but it is unlikely that it came from one of his tragedies. Nor is there any reason to identify the speaker of **F 10?** as Dionysius or the wife lamented there as Doris (who is not known to

[33] For doubts about **[F 9]** in particular see e.g. Nauck 1889, 796, echoed by Olivieri 1950, 100. All three fragments are assigned to Dionysius in *TrGF*.

[34] For Dionysius's marriages and children see Caven 1990, 98, 175, 242f. Doris was the mother of his two eldest sons (Dionysius II and Hermocritus) and his youngest daughter (Dicaeosyne, 'Righteousness': cf. Plutarch citing **F 4**).

have died in Dionysius's lifetime). Similarly **F 11?** may have nothing to do with a play mocking Plato (see note below).

The picture of Dionysius as an incompetent poet (perhaps including his unsuccessful use of Aeschylus's writing-tablet) may well be due to Eubulus's comedy *Dionysius* (date unknown, but Eubulus's dramatic career probably began in the 370s).[35] The few remnants of this play (frs 24–29 *PCG*: »» Hunter 1983, 45f., 116–22, Farmer 2017, 46–50) suggest that it was set in Dionysius's household, described the tyrant ironically as tolerant of mockery (fr. 25 = Dionysius T 12 *TrGF*) and compared his tragedies unfavourably with both Aeschylus and Euripides. The presence of Dionysius's wife (**[F 9]**) is easily understood in this comic context. **F 10?** and **F 11?** might be verses of Dionysius, quoted or parodied for comic effect.

[F 9]

†*Doris(?)* . . . †: the Greek phrase is unmetrical and has not been convincingly emended. C. F. Hermann's Δωρὶς τέθνηκεν, 'Doris is dead' depends on the unjustified assumptions that **F 10?** refers to Dionysius's wife and that the tyrant would have chosen to make a public exhibition of her death. Seiler's Δωρίδιον ἦκεν, 'little Doris has arrived/returned' is closer to the transmitted text, but Dionysius would hardly have made a dramatic character refer to his own wife with a diminutive.

F 10?

Either a genuine verse of Dionysius or a parody, probably spoken by a comic Dionysius in either case. What Lucian found ridiculous was perhaps the use of **χρησίμην**, **serviceable** in this context. The word could be used for 'good/useful' citizens (LSJ 'χρήσιμος' I.2), but χρηστός was normal for 'good, worthy' people in non-political senses including good wives (LSJ 'χρηστός' II.1; Eur. *IA* 750, *Antiope* F 212, Eubulus fr. 115.11–14 *PCG*, Men. *Monost*. 155, 835 Jäkel/Pernigotti). Stephanopoulos 1989, 296f. suggests that Lucian (or a comic predecessor?) imputed a sexual connotation to the word. Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 153 notes similarities with the laments for Alcestis of Admetus, his sons and the chorus in Eur. *Alcestis* (esp. *Alc.* 44, 150f., 384–405, 418).

F 11?

The verse is quoted once by Lucian more than five hundred years after Dionysius' time and twice by Tzetzes a thousand years after that. For Tzetzes it was apparently proverbial. It may have originated in a play by Dionysius, but if Lucian found it laughable this will be because he (and the anecdotal tradition in general) knew it in isolation, probably via a comedy satirizing the tyrant; he probably did not know the original play or its content. Tzetzes is even less likely

[35] As suggested by Meineke 1839, 362; cf. Hunter 1983, 117, *PCG* V.203.

to have known anything about it (he probably knew the verse from Lucian). In *Hist.* 5.23 Tzetzes discusses three purported reasons why Dionysius sold Plato into slavery, dismissing two of them (that Plato praised the statues of the tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogiton to his face, a story normally connected with Antiphon [cf. Antiphon **T 2**], and that he was jealous of Plato's success as a writer) and opting for a third, that Plato had plotted against him with Dion.[36] The remarks about *The Ransoming of Hector* and 'the play he wrote against Plato' follow, with **Those amongst men etc.** explained as coming from the latter (see **T 3**). Tzetzes himself indicates that this ascription is a guess (**δοκῶ**, **I suppose**). The idea that Dionysius devoted an entire play to attacking Plato is no doubt an invention or a misunderstanding, either by Tzetzes himself or an anecdotal source. It may have been prompted by a belief that the verse was directed at Plato, but that too will probably have been a comic or pseudo-biographical interpretation. The real dramatic context of the verse and the nature of the play from which it came are unknowable.

Tzetzes' claims are accepted more or less confidently by Suess 1966, 300f., Simon 1982, 482, *MusTr* 293 n. 11, Duncan 2012, 147, Wright 2016a, 139; doubted by e.g. Welcker 1841, 1236, Stroheker 1958, 106, Monoson 2012, 161f.

F 12

From this evidence it seems that Dionysius was notorious for creating perverse etymologies,[37] the topic discussed in Athenaeus 3.97c–99e (the speaker adds Cassander of Macedon's brother Anaxarchus as a yet more egregious example). Some of these appear as grammarians' examples, unattributed, in the scholia to Dionysius Thrax (a–c, f, h: pp. 11 and 452 Hilgard), the *Etymologicum Magnum* (s.v. 'βαλλάντιον', 'ἑλκύδριον') and Michael Psellus, *Poemata* 6.166–74 Westerink (a–c, paraphrasing Schol. Dionys. Thrax in verse). The earliest reference to them is from the fourth-century Sicilian historian Athanis (*FGrH* 562 F 1 in Athenaeus 3.98d), whose work extended from the late 360s to at least the 330s.

Most of the etymologies are parsed by Helladius (d), Athenaeus (a, f, g, h), the Socratic Letter (l) or the scholia to Dionysius Thrax (b, c: see footnotes to **F 12**); the others (e, i, k) have to be guessed (footnotes *ibid.*). In at least two cases there is more to the etymology than meets the eye. The **cloak** defined as 'a wasting of wool' (**ἐρι-ώλη**) recalls a joke in Aristophanes' *Wasps* 1145–49, where Philocleon claims that the fine oriental cloak he has bought for his father consumed a talent's weight of wool and Bdelycleon comments that in that case it

[36] Tzetzes repeats the account in *Hist.* 10.359 (*How Plato, detected plotting about tyranny with Dion, was given to Pollis and put up for sale*).

[37] The practice of *etymologia*, identifying supposed original or 'true' meanings of words, became well established in the later fifth and the fourth centuries: »» *OCD* 'Etymology')

should be called an ἐριώλη. The **pillar** defined as 'standing strong' (**μενεκράτης**) perhaps evokes the tomb-*stélê* to which Achilles' grieving horses are likened in *Iliad* 17.434ff. (ἀλλ' ὥς τε στήλη μένει ἔμπεδον . . . '). Suess (1966, 310–13) suggests some further, less plausible interpretations (purse = **javelin** because you can bribe your way into a besieged city; Thyestes a **pestle** because he crushed his sons' flesh in the infamous feast; mysteries = **mouseholes** because people seek relief in them; and so on). The word **γαρότας** is otherwise unknown and may be an invention of Dionysius by analogy with such words as γαπόνος 'earth-labourer'. **καρποτόκος** appears only in the Socratic Letter and is not explicitly attributed to Dionysius; it could have been invented by the letter-writer (Köhler 1928, 127).[38]

The sources imply that these riddling etymologies were poeticisms challenging interpretation and anticipating a trend which became prevalent amongst Hellenistic poets (Helladius compares examples from Euphorion; Schol. Dionys. Thrax mentions others from Lycophron's *Alexandra* and the Theocritean *Syrinx*). Interpretations will then have been a matter for listeners or readers rather than provided by the poet as in, say, a scene where riddles were posed and answered. Some words seem suited to comic contexts (**bucket**, **mouse-holes**, the **cloak** as explained above) and might have come from satyr-plays.[39] This is not excluded by Helladius's reference to 'tragedies', but the fact that they were criticized on stylistic grounds suggests that most were from tragedies (cf. Zuretti 1897, 553).

F 13

Added to the testimonia for Dionysius's tragedies by Kassel 1966, 8–10 and discussed by Suess 1966, 303f. Timaeus's **constantly** must be an exaggeration, but Dionysius may have been noted for composing extended descriptions (*ekphrases*) of luxurious furnishings etc. which enhanced or foreshadowed dramatic events, especially in messengers' reports (e.g. Eur. *Ion* 1143–65). The fabrics which were part of the ransom offered by Priam to Achilles (above, p. 181) might have been a case in point. Dionysius's own taste for luxurious dress was notorious; Kassel cites [Aristot.] *Mir.* 96, Athenaeus 12.535e (Douris *FGrH* 76 F 14).

---

[38] The form of the word used by Dionysius is uncertain (see **F 12** app. crit.). καρποτόκος is normal. Sykutris supposed a form καρπότεξ, analogous with ἐπίτεξ/ἐπίτοκος 'about to give birth', ἄτεξ/ἄτοκος 'not having given birth', ἀγχίτεξ/ἀγχίτοκος 'close to giving birth', καλλίτεξ/καλλίτοκος 'having fine offspring'. καρπότοκα (acc.) could even be right, cf. ἐπίτοκα (= ἐπίτοκον) in Ionic (Hdt. 1.108.2) and Doric (*IG* 5.1.1390.33 and 68, Messenia, 92/91 BC).

[39] Nauck 1889, 796 questioned their tragic character. Webster (1954, 298) thought the **mouse-holes** were parody.

CLEAENETUS
(*TrGF* 84)

Texts etc. *TrGF* 1[2].250f.

The Victors Lists inscription records a third place for Cleaenetus at the Lenaea of 363 with Hypsipyle *and* Ph[*(T 4:* TrGF *1[2].341f.). Otherwise we have only a comment on his greed from the comic poet Alexis (**T 1**,*

T 1 Alexis fr. 268 *PCG* (from Athenaeus *epit.* 2.55c, unattributed; 2–3 τοὺς–κατέλιπεν Pollux 6.45 attrib. Alexis; 6–7 οὐδενὸς–λέπος Eustathius on *Odyssey* 19.233, unattributed).

μὴ ὥρασι ⟨ ≍ ⟩
μετὰ τῶν κακῶν ἵκοιθ' ὁ τοὺς θέρμους φαγών,
ἐν τῷ προθύρῳ τὰ λέμμαθ' ὁτιὴ κατέλιπεν,
ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπεπνίγη καταφαγών· μάλιστα δὲ
⟨ ⟩
(— ?) Κλεαίνετος μὲν οὐκ ἐδήδοκ' οἶδ' ὅτι
ὁ τραγικὸς αὐτούς· οὐδενὸς γὰρ πώποτε
ἀπέβαλεν ⟨ ⟩ ὀσπρίου λέπος·
οὕτως ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν εὐχερὴς ἀνήρ.

1 ⟨μὲν⟩ Hermann, *alii alia* 1–2 ἵκοιτο μὴ ὥρασιν (deleting μετὰ τῶν κακῶν) Bergk (ὥρασ' *or* ὥρας Arnott) 3 ἐπὶ τῶν προθύρων Pollux

T 2 Aeschines 1.98

τὴν μὲν γὰρ οἰκίαν τὴν ἐν ἄστει ἀπέδοθ' οὗτος (*sc.* Τίμαρχος) Ναυσικράτει τῷ κωμικῷ ποιητῇ, ὕστερον δ' αὐτὴν ἐπρίατο παρὰ τοῦ Ναυσικράτους εἴκοσι μνῶν Κλεαίνετος ὁ χοροδιδάσκαλος.

T 3 *See Carcinus II **T 7***

F 1 Stobaeus 4.25.5

Κλεαινέτου·

γεννητόρων ἕκατι κατθανεῖν καλόν.

F 2 Stobaeus 4.35.2

Κλεαινέτου·

λύπη γὰρ ὀργή τ' εἰς ἕνα ψυχῆς τόπον
ἐλθόντα μανία τοῖς ἔχουσι γίγνεται.

*not before 360), a mention of his buying a house in a speech of Aeschines delivered in 345 (**T 2**), his reputation as a 'bad poet' in the Epicurean tradition (Philodemus, **T 3**), and the two quotations in Stobaeus (**F 1–2**).*

T 1 Alexis, unidentified comedy

Bad luck and misery to the man who ate those lupin-beans; he left the pods in front of the door and didn't swallow them and choke. And most of all . . .

(some text missing, then possibly a different speaker)

Cleaenetus the tragic poet didn't eat them, I'm certain; he's never discarded a single bean-pod, he's such a greedy man.

T 2 Aeschines, *Against Timarchus*

This man (i.e. Timarchus) sold the house in the city to Nausicrates the comic poet, and later Cleaenetus the chorus-director bought it from Nausicrates for twenty minas.

T 3 *See Carcinus II **T 7***

F 1 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'That parents should be properly honoured by their children etc.'

Cleaenetus:

It's a fine thing to die for one's parents.

F 2 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On grief, that it is very burdensome and painful for thoughtful people'

Cleaenetus:

Grief and anger, entering a single place in the soul, become madness in those who suffer them.

Notes on Cleaenetus

T 1
Athenaeus quotes this in a long list of symposium menu items. Text and interpretation are fully discussed by Arnott on Alexis fr. 268 (see also Arnott on fr. 167.11 for lupin-seeds as a foodstuff).

T 2
Aeschines mentions the house as part of the inheritance which Timarchus irresponsibly squandered, 'hastening to satisfy his lusts' (1.96). For Nausicrates see *PCG* VII.33–35: two titles and three text-fragments are recorded, and an entry in the comic Victors List (*IG* II^2 2325, 148) shows three Lenaea victories.

T 3
See on Carcinus II **T 7** (p. 84 above).

F 2
For grief leading to madness cf. Alexis frs 294, 298 *PCG*, Antiphanes fr. 287 *PCG*, Philemon fr. 106 *PCG*, all cited in this chapter of Stobaeus; more in Arnott 1996, 788 on Alexis fr. 294. Euripides' Orestes describes his illness as a combination of conscience, grief and fits of madness which punish him for killing his mother (*Or.* 395–400). The Roman crowd pursued Caesar's assassins 'so madly in their anger and grief' (οὕτω δὴ μανιωδῶς ὑπὸ ὀργῆς τε καὶ λύπης) that they tore to pieces the innocent tribune Helvius Cinna, mistaking him for the praetor Lucius Cornelius Cinna (Appian, *BC* 2.147).

DIOGENES OF SINOPE
(*TrGF* 88)

Texts etc. TrGF 1^2.253–58 with *addenda* 1^2.355, 5.1113; *SSR* V-B, nos 128–136; *MusTr* 188–93, 294.

Discussions. Weber 1887, 141–54; Zwierlein 1966, 134–37; Giannantoni in *SSR* IV.475–84; Döring 1993, 337–43; López Cruces–Campos Daroca 1998–99, 45–49; Noussia 2006; Wright 2016a, 153–63; Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 60–62.

Cynic philosophy. Dudley 1937; Goulet-Cazé 1986, 2003, 2017 (esp. 53–76, 150–55 on Diogenes); Branham–Goulet-Cazé 1996; Desmond 2008.

*Diogenes lived from near the end of the fifth century to the late 320s. He was generally recognized as the founder of the Cynic movement which spurned the theoretical interests of philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle and focused exclusively on the practical business of living 'in accordance with nature' (*kata phusin*). Diogenes rejected established social and political structures and conventions (*nomoi*) in favour of individual self-reliance, self-discipline and indifference to the rigours of nature and the demands and inhibitions of 'civilized' life. His teachings influenced the early Stoics (Zeno, Cleanthes, Chrysippus) and were popular throughout antiquity, but they were apparently debased by later followers who used them primarily as a basis for antisocial behaviour. They were also fiercely criticized by the more orthodox philosophical schools and by Christian writers, who either misunderstood or misrepresented their original intentions. It is therefore difficult to define Diogenes' teachings in detail, and the difficulty is compounded by uncertainty about what, if anything, he put in writing. In* ***T 1*** *Diogenes Laertius says that thirteen dialogues, a collection of letters and seven tragedies were preserved under his name, that the Hellenistic scholars Sosicrates and Satyrus denied that he had written anything, that Satyrus attributed the* tragoidaria *('little tragedies') to Diogenes' follower Philiscus, and that the Hellenistic doxographer Sotion gave another list of Diogenes' works which only partially agrees with the first and includes no tragedies. These uncertainties are reflected in* ***F 1d****, where Diogenes Laertius ascribes Diogenes' justification of anthropophagy to his* Thyestes*, 'if indeed the tragedies are his . . . (etc.)'. On the other hand, Philodemus (****T 2****) refers to the* Politeia *(a dialogue listed by Diogenes*

Laertius), the tragedies Atreus *(probably the same as* Thyestes*) and* Oedipus*, and a* Philiscus *(a dialogue listed by Sotion) as definitely Diogenes' own works. Lastly the Emperor Julian (**T 3**) argues ambivalently that the disreputable works ascribed to Diogenes were not meant seriously and/or that the tragedies were in any case composed by Philiscus.*

*The likeliest explanation for these confusions is that Diogenes did write at least some of the works ascribed to him and that his authorship was denied by those who thought he could not have produced any writings (either on principle, like Socrates, or because of his vagrant lifestyle), or who wanted to dissociate him from the outrageous doctrines that the writings contained. In particular, the Stoic school included Diogenes in the Socratic tradition which they traced through Antisthenes, Diogenes and Crates of Thebes to the foundation of their own school by Zeno of Citium; some later Stoics therefore felt the need to disown the more offensive views attributed to Diogenes and to those early Stoics who had adopted them. This is evident from Philodemus's critique in **T 2**, which provides strong evidence for the authenticity of Diogenes'* Politeia *(cited by early Stoics as genuine within a century of his death) and implies that the tragedies* Atreus/Thyestes *and* Oedipus *and the dialogue* Philiscus *were widely regarded as authentic as well. Most scholars are now inclined to ascribe at least these works and the other tragedies to Diogenes.*[1]

Given what we know about their scandalous content, and about Diogenes' disdain for civic institutions and dramatic festivals in particular,[2] *it seems impossible that the tragedies were composed for conventional public performances. We might imagine him exhibiting them in subversive 'fringe' performances at festivals, but more likely they were designed as quasi-dramatic pieces for declamation and reading.*[3] *Satyrus's term* tragoidaria *('little tragedies') and the summaries of Diogenes' argu-*

[1] On these issues see especially Dümmler 1882, 64–68, von Fritz 1926, 55–58, Dudley 1937, 25–27, Goulet-Cazé 1986, 85–90, 2003, 11–27, Schorn 2004, 152–57. On the content of the *Politeia*, Goulet-Cazé 2003, 33–38, 47–51, 57–60, 73–82.

[2] According to Diogenes Laertius 6.24 Diogenes called the Dionysiac contests 'great puppet-shows for fools (μεγάλα θαύματα μωροῖς)'.

[3] Zwierlein 1966, 134–37 identified them as our earliest examples of 'Lesedramen'. Julian however assumed they were declaimed publicly (**T 3(b)**).

ments about the crimes of Thyestes (Diogenes Laertius, ***F 1d)*** *and Oedipus (Dio Chrysostom, below, pp. 216–19), if these reflect the tragedies, suggest that they need have been no more than dramatic dialogues in which a traditional tragic character encountered a Cynic philosopher, lamented his fate and learned from the philosopher's ironic criticisms how misguided his actions and reactions had been.*[4]

The seven titles listed by Diogenes Laertius in ***T 1*** *(*Helen*,* Thyestes*,* Heracles*,* Achilles*,* Medea*,* Chrysippus*,* Oedipus*) are wrongly ascribed to Diogenes of Athens in Suda δ 1142 (Diogenes Ath.* ***T 1****, Vol. 1). No text-fragments are ascribed explicitly to any of the named tragedies, and* Helen*,* Achilles *and* Chrysippus *are known only by their titles: they may have focused on Helen's elopement with Paris, Achilles' erotic relationship with Patroclus, and Laius's abduction of Chrysippus, and on the naturalness of these characters' misdemeanours.*[5] *More can be inferred from indirect evidence about the likely content of the other four, and these are discussed individually below. Nauck printed two text-fragments as being from tragedies of Diogenes (****F 1h****, ****[F 2]****), and Snell in* TrGF *(following Wilamowitz) added five further text-fragments (****F 3?****, ****[F 4–7]****) as being from Cynic tragedies by either Diogenes or Philiscus or Crates. In my opinion all of these attributions are unjustified except for* ***F 1h*** *(the only text-fragment explicitly ascribed to Diogenes by its source) and possibly* ***F 3?*** *(*Heracles*?): for details see the notes below.*

---

[4] **F 3?** would also fit this pattern, Heracles mistakenly declaring that virtue is subordinate to fortune. On the general character and design of the tragedies see e.g. Bartalucci 1970–71, 112–14, Döring 1993, 337–43, López Cruces–Campos Daroca 1998–99, 45–49, López Cruces 2003a. Noussia (2006, 231) suggests they were monologues, but the fact that they were named for individuals (*Oedipus*, *Thyestes* etc.) is hardly evidence of that. López Cruces (2003a and elsewhere) proposes a more ambitious account of the plays as complete dramas adding comic and satyric elements to established tragic plots and refashioning their outcomes in Cynic terms.

[5] López Cruces 2008 proposes that *Achilles* was a Cynic refashioning of Aeschylus's *Phrygians* (cf. above, p. 180 on Dionysius's *Ransoming of Hector*) with Achilles recognizing the futility of tormenting a corpse, accepting the finality of death and renouncing glory. Weber (1887, 148f.) made a tortuous case for linking a mention of Helen's grief-banishing drug (*Odyssey* 4.219ff.) in [Diogenes] *Epist.* 17 with Diogenes' *Helen*. Helen is mentioned with Jocasta and the Philomela in a very damaged part of Philodemus, *On The Stoics* (P. Herc. 155+339 col. 21.6 Dorandi), apparently as an example of the unnatural actions of women that Cynics approve (cf. Dorandi 1982, 127).

T 1 Diogenes Laertius 6.80

φέρεται δ' αὐτοῦ βιβλία τάδε . . . . . τραγῳδίαι ἑπτά· Ἑλένη, Θυέστης, Ἡρακλῆς, Ἀχιλλεύς, Μήδεια, Χρύσιππος, Οἰδίπους. Σωσικράτης δ' ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῆς Διαδοχῆς καὶ Σάτυρος ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ τῶν Βίων οὐδὲν εἶναι τοῦ Διογένους φασί· τά τε τραγῳδάριά φησιν ὁ Σάτυρος Φιλίσκου εἶναι τοῦ Αἰγινήτου, γνωρίμου τοῦ Διογένους. Σωτίων δὲ ἐν τῷ ἑβδόμῳ ταῦτα μόνα φησὶ Διογένους εἶναι . . . .

T 2 Philodemus, *De Stoicis*, P. Herc. 155+339 (ed. Dorandi 1982) cols. 15.12–28, 16.12–22, 16.29–17.4

ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐπεί τινες τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ περὶ τῆς Διογένους, ὥς γέ φα[15]σι, διστάζουσιν Πολιτείας ὑπεκδυόμενοι τὴν Στοά[ν, ῥ]ητέον ἂν εἴη τὸ καὶ Δ[ιο]γένους εἶναι καὶ τὸν τρόπον ἔχουσαν τοῦτον, ὡς αἵ τ' ἀναγραφαὶ τῶν πινάκων[20] αἵ τε βυβλιοθῆκαι σημαίνουσιν. καὶ Κλεάνθης ἐν τῶι Περὶ στολῆς ὡς Διογένους αὐτῆς μνημονεύει καὶ ἐπαινεῖ καὶ κοινῶς τε τῶν ἐν αὐτῆι [. . . . .] κἀ[25]πὶ μέρους ἐνίων ἔχθεσιν ποιεῖται· καὶ Χρύσιππος ἐν τῶ[ι Περ[ὶ] πόλεως κα[ὶ] νόμου δι' αὐτ[ῆς μι]μνήσκετα[ι] . . . *(examples)*. . . (16.12) ἅμ[α κἀν] τ[ῶι] Περὶ τὸν κατὰ φύσιν βίον μνημονεύει γε αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν ἐκεῖ[15] δυσσεβῶν ο[ἷς] κα[ὶ σ]υνκατατίθεται· κἀν [τῶι] δ΄ [Περὶ] τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τῆς ἡδ[ονῆς πολλά]κις αὐτῆς κα[ὶ] τῶν ἐν αὐτῆι μιμνήσκ[ε]ται μετ' [ἐγ]κωμίω[ν.][20] κἀν τῶι [γ΄] Περὶ δ[ι]καιο[σ]ύνη[ς] τὸ περὶ τῆς ἀνθρωποφαγ[ίας] δόγμα ε[. .]σ[. . .]εσκει[. . . *(text damaged)* . . . (16.29) αὐ]τός θ' ὁ Διογένης ἔν τε τῶι Ἀτρεῖ κα[ὶ] τῶι Οἰδί-ποδι [κα]ὶ τ[ῶι Φιλί][17.1]σκωι τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν κατὰ τὴν Π]ολιτείαν αἰσχρῶν καὶ ἀνοσίων ὡς ἀρέσκοντα καταχωρ[ί]ζει.

T 3 Julian Imp. **(a)** *Or.* 9.7, 186b–c, **(b)** *Or.* 7.4–8, 208c–211d

(a) εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐπεποίητο τοῖς ἀνδράσι μετά τινος σπουδῆς, ἀλλὰ μὴ μετὰ παιδιᾶς, τὰ συγγράμματα, τούτοις ἐχρῆν ἑπόμενον ἐπιχειρεῖν ἕκαστα ὧν διανοούμεθα περὶ τοῦ πράγματος ἐξετάζειν . . . ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐθέν ἐστιν, ὡς ἔφην, τοιοῦτον· αἵ τε γὰρ θρυλλούμεναι Διογένους τραγῳδίαι Φιλίσκου τινὸς Αἰγινήτου λέγονται εἶναι, καὶ εἰ Διογένους δὲ εἶεν, οὐθὲν ἄτοπόν ἐστι τὸν σοφὸν παίζειν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο πολλοὶ φαίνονται <τῶν> φιλοσόφων ποιήσαντες.

(b) ἀλλ' ἴσως ὁ μὲν λόγος οὗ φησι δεῖν ἀντὶ τῶν ἀληθῶν καὶ μὴ πεπλασμένων τὰ ψευδῆ καὶ πεπλασμένα παρὰ τοῦ κυνός, 'ᾧ μόνῳ τῆς ἐλευθερίας μέτεστιν', ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς ᾄδεσθαι συλλόγοις, ἡ συνήθεια δὲ αὐτῷ γέγονεν ἀπὸ Διογένους ἀρξαμένη καὶ Κράτητος ἄχρι τῶν ἐφεξῆς. οὐδὲν οὐδαμοῦ παράδειγμα τοιοῦτον εὑρήσεις . . . (210c) τὰς ἀναφερομένας δὲ εἰς τὸν Διογένη τραγῳδίας, οὔσας μὲν καὶ ὁμολογουμένας κυνικοῦ τινος συγγράμματα, ἀμφισβητουμένας δὲ κατὰ τοῦ-

T 1 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers, Diogenes*

The following works of his are transmitted . . . *(13 named dialogues; letters)* . . . seven tragedies: *Helen, Thyestes, Heracles, Achilles, Medea, Chrysippus, Oedipus*. But Sosicrates in Book 1 of his *Succession* (fr. 11 Giannattasio Andria) and Satyrus in Book 4 of his *Lives* (F 1 Schorn) say there is nothing by Diogenes; and Satyrus says the little tragedies are by Philiscus of Aegina, an associate of Diogenes. Sotion in his Book 7 (fr. 19 Wehrli) says that only the following are by Diogenes . . . *(13 dialogues, most with titles different from the previous list; anecdotes; letters).*

T 2 Philodemus, *On The Stoics*

But since some (*sc.* Stoics) of our time are actually in doubt, so they claim, concerning Diogenes' *Politeia*,[15] distancing themselves from the Stoa, it should be affirmed that it is by Diogenes, even if it has this character, as the copies of the catalogues and the libraries indicate.[20] And Cleanthes in his *On dress* refers to it as being by Diogenes and commends it, and *(describes)* its contents in general and sets out some of them in detail.[25] And Chrysippus in his *On the city and the law* makes mention through it . . . *(examples of Chrysippus citing Diogenes'* Politeia*)* . . . (16.12) And again in his *On the life in accordance with nature* he mentions it and the impious things in it, which he actually endorses; and in Book 4 of *On virtue and pleasure* he often refers to it with acclaim. And in *(Book 3)* of his *On justice (he says that?)* the doctrine concerning anthropophagy *(is approved?)* . . . *(text damaged)* . . . (16.29) And Diogenes himself in *Atreus* and *Oedipus* and [*Phili*]*scus* classifies most of the ugly and unholy things found in the *Republic* as being approved.

T 3 Emperor Julian, **(a)** *To the uneducated Cynics*, **(b)** *To the Cynic Heraclius*

(a) Now if these men (i.e. the early Cynics) had composed their writings with some seriousness and not playfully, he (i.e. my ignorant Cynic opponent) should have followed these and so tried to refute each of my opinions on the matter . . . But as I have said, there is no such writing; for the much talked of tragedies of Diogenes are said to be by one Philiscus of Aegina, and if they were by Diogenes there is nothing surprising in the wise man's having some fun; it's clear in fact that many of the philosophers did this.

(b) But perhaps you will say, while reason declares that the Cynic, 'who alone partakes in freedom', ought not to declaim deceptive fictions in public gatherings rather than plain truths, yet the practice began with Diogenes and Crates and has continued down to their successors. No such example will you find anywhere! . . . *(recent Cynics such as Oenomaus have in fact perverted the masters' teachings)* . . . As for the tragedies ascribed to Diogenes, which are and are generally agreed to be the works of some Cynic and are disputed only in this respect,

το μόνον, εἴτε τοῦ διδασκάλου, τοῦ Διογένους, εἰσίν, εἴτε τοῦ μαθητοῦ Φιλίσκου, τίς ⟨οὐκ⟩ ἐπελθὼν βδελύξαιτο καὶ νομίσαιτο ὑπερβολὴν ἀρρητουργίας . . . ταῖς Οἰνομάου δὲ ἐντυχών, ἔγραψε γὰρ καὶ τραγῳδίας τοῖς λόγοις τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ παραπλησίας, ἀρρήτων ἀρρητότερα καὶ κακῶν πέρα . . . (211a) καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐκ τούτων τις ἀξιοῖ τὸν κυνισμὸν ὁποῖός τίς ἐστιν ἡμῖν ἐπιδεῖξαι . . . ἴτω, χαιρέτω, γῆν πρὸ γῆς, ὅποι βούλοιτο. εἰ δ', ὅπερ ὁ θεὸς ἔφη Διογένει, 'τὸ νόμισμα παραχαράξας' ἐπὶ τὴν πρὸ ταύτης εἰρημένην ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ συμβουλὴν τρέποιτο, τὸ 'γνῶθι σαυτόν', ὅπερ ζηλώσαντες ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων Διογένης καὶ Κράτης φαίνονται, τοῦτο ἤδη τοῦ παντὸς ἄξιον ἔγωγε φαίην ἂν ἀνδρὶ καὶ στρατηγεῖν καὶ φιλοσοφεῖν ἐθέλοντι. . . . (211d) οὗτος οὖν ὁ Διογένης ὁποῖός τις ἦν τά τε πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, μὴ διὰ τῶν Οἰνομάου λόγων μηδὲ τῶν Φιλίσκου τραγῳδιῶν, αἷς ἐπιγράψας τὸ Διογένους ὄνομα τῆς θείας πολλά ποτε κατεψεύσατο κεφαλῆς, ἀλλὰ δι' ὧν ἔδρασεν ἔργων ὁποῖός τις ἦν γνωριζέσθω.

[T 4] = *Diogenes of Athens* **T 2** *(Vol. 1).*

ΑΤΡΕΥΣ

See **T 2** *with note and below on* Thyestes.

ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ

Weber 1887, 149–53; Wilamowitz 1895, II.103 n. 186 and 1925, 304f.; Bartalucci 1970–71; Tosi 1995, 939–45; Noussia 2006, 237–42; López Cruces 2010.

Heracles was a natural subject for a tragedy of Diogenes, being both a well-established tragic figure, notably in Sophocles' Women of Trachis *and Euripides'* Heracles*, and an ethical role-model in his acceptance of a life of toil and hardships (*ponoi*) in pursuit of virtue, especially in Prodicus's* Choice of Heracles *(Xen.* Mem. *2.1.21–34) and at least two dialogues of Antisthenes. Only the title of Diogenes' tragedy is directly attested (in Diogenes Laertius's list,* ***T 1****). Three possible sources for its content have been proposed:*

(1) The early Christian advocate Tertullian includes Diogenes amongst pagan philosophers who treated the pagan gods with con-

whether they are by the master Diogenes or his pupil Philiscus — who could approach them without detesting them or considering them an extreme of lewdness . . . ? Yet when he came upon those of Oenomaus, who wrote tragedies that were similar to his own discourses, worse than unspeakable and beyond evil . . . *(more condemnation of Oenomaus's tragedies)* . . . and if anyone thought to use these in order to teach us the character of Cynicism . . . let him be gone and good riddance, 'roaming from land to land'[6] wherever he chooses. But if, as the god said to Diogenes, he were to 'Restamp the currency' and turn to the god's previous advice, to 'Know thyself', which Diogenes and Crates clearly emulated in their actions, this I should say is completely fitting for a man who wishes to be a leader and a philosopher . . . *(explanation of Apollo's meanings)* . . . What kind of man, then, this Diogenes was in his relations with gods and men should be learned, not through the discourses of Oenomaus, nor through the tragedies of Philiscus on which he set Diogenes' name, thus greatly slandering his divine person, but through what he himself did.

[T 4] = *Diogenes of Athens* **T 2** *(Vol. 1).*

ATREUS

See opposite.

HERACLES

tempt.[7] *Tertullian may have been alluding to Diogenes' tragedy, but this in itself is too vague to be of much help in reconstructing the play or defining its general character.*

(2) In one of Lucian's thirty satirical Dialogues of the Dead *(no. 11) Diogenes meets Heracles in the underworld and quizzes him about his apparently being three different beings: a god on Olympus, a phantom amongst the dead and a disintegrated corpse in the earth. Weber (1887)*

---

[6] γῆν πρὸ γῆς, lit. '(to) land before land', is an idiomatic phrase found in [Aesch.] *Prometheus Bound* 682, Aristophanes' *Acharnians* 235 and later writers.

[7] Tertullian, *Apologeticus* 14.9, *sed et Diogenes nescio quid in Herculem ludit, et Romanus cynicus Varro trecentos Ioves, sive Iuppiteros dicendum, sine capitibus inducit*, 'but Diogenes too makes some fun of Hercules, and the Roman cynic Varro (fr. 582 Buecheler) brings in three hundred Joves — or should one say Jupiters? — without heads'. Similarly Tertullian, *Ad Nationes* 1.10.43.

argued that Varro (as cited by Tertullian) and Lucian must both have been influenced by the same satirical work, and that this work was Diogenes' Heracles*; the* Heracles*, then, was a* paignion *or pseudo–tragedy designed to deflate the traditional view of Heracles' dual mortal–divine nature epitomized in Homer's account of Odysseus's encounter with Heracles in the Underworld (*Odyssey *11.600–3). It is however unlikely that Diogenes would have chosen to satirize Heracles, his model of dedicated toil, and the comparison with Lucian seems to reduce Diogenes' play to a dialogue set in the underworld with Heracles already dead, which again seems unlikely. Lucian did not need to draw on a five-hundred-year-old text for his squib, which is just one amongst six of his* Dialogues of the Dead *that feature Diogenes. Bartalucci argued that the* Heracles *will have been a serious work and similar to plays such as* Thyestes *and* Oedipus*, which seem to have used their tragic subjects as a basis for rationalistic, if incidentally humorous, criticism.*

(3) Also possibly relevant is ***F 3?****, a reflection on virtue which according to Cassius Dio was declaimed by M. Junius Brutus as he resolved to have himself killed after the Battle of Philippi in 42 BC (see below, p. 221). The couplet is also quoted by Plutarch, incompletely and out of context, and with two additional tragic-sounding phrases which may or may not be from the same speech (see* ***F 3?*** *n.). Neither Dio nor Plutarch identifies the author, but Dio indicates that the speaker was Heracles and his context suggests that the words were spoken in a tragedy by a despairing Heracles as he, like Brutus, prepared to die; the scene would thus resemble the culminating scene of Sophocles'* Women of Trachis.[8] *Wilamowitz in his edition of Euripides'* Heracles *ascribed the couplet to the* Heracles *'of Diogenes or pseudo-Diogenes' and in 1925 added Plutarch's additional phrases.*[9] *The ascription of the couplet is accepted by Tosi ('pseudo-Diogenes', p. 945), Noussia and López-Cruces (both 'Diogenes'). Wilamowitz pointed out that the words 'you, it appears, were a slave to fortune' echo the words of Euripides' Heracles after he has been driven to kill his own family in a fit of madness,*[10] *but*

[8] *Herculis . . . cum moriendum sibi esse crederet* (Wilamowitz 1893, 18). López-Cruces 2010, 13f. suggests an exact parallel, Heracles demanding the lighting of his pyre just as Brutus demands his death-blow.

[9] Wilamowitz 1895, II.103 n. 186; 1925, 304f.

[10] Eur. *Heracles* 1397: νῦν δ', ὡς ἔοικε, τῇ τύχῃ δουλευτέον, 'But now, as it seems, I must be a slave to fortune'.

that now Heracles declares his pursuit of virtue futile because virtue itself is subordinate to fortune; the couplet thus alludes to the virtue-oriented Heracles of Diogenes' philosophical predecessors but is inconsistent with Diogenes' own teaching since Heracles has not learned to spurn fortune through the use of reason.[11] *The play, then, will have shown the limitations of such an understanding of virtue and the superiority of Diogenes' doctrine, which Heracles may finally have recognized.*

The ascription of ***F 3?*** *to Diogenes'* Heracles *is attractive though not conclusive. Heracles must have been a common subject for tragedies,*[12] *and others may have shown him regretting his dedication to virtue. We do not know that* ***F 3?*** *was delivered in order to be subjected to Cynic criticism, and we might ask why, if it was, the Stoic Brutus chose to quote it as he prepared to die. But even if the ascription is rejected it remains likely, as Bartalucci argued, that Diogenes'* Heracles *was similar in style and intent to his other tragedies.*

López Cruces ascribes the papyrus fragment P. Oxy. 27.2454 (TrGF adesp. F 653) unconvincingly to Diogenes' Heracles.[13] *The scene is Mt. Oeta and the text includes (parts of) the last thirty-two lines of a speech of Heracles reviewing the achievements of his labours and the first twenty-six lines of a further speech decrying Hera's hostility, his lost hopes of immortality and Deianeira's part in destroying him. This is probably from a post-5th century* Heracles *but is surely too conventional and too long-winded for Diogenes.*

---

[11] 'Dieser Herakles war also nicht mehr der rechte Kyniker, sonst würde er die τύχη verachten — auch das antisthenische Ideal war gewogen und zu leicht befunden.'

[12] We know of a *Heracles on the Pyre* by Spintharus (*TrGF* 40, properly placed in the late 4th C.), a *Heracles* by Lycophron of Chalcis (Lycophron **T 3**, p. 293 below), and a *Heracles* by Timesitheus (*TrGF* 214, date unknown). See also *TrGF* adesp. F 126 and F 653.

[13] López Cruces 2004, cf. 2010, 14–16. The papyrus was published by Turner in 1962: see *TrGF* adesp. F 653 for summary and early bibliography.

ΘΥΕΣΤΗΣ

Weber 1887, 145–47, 148; Donzelli 1965, esp. 265f.; Goulet-Cazé 2003, 34–36, 63–65, 69–71, 75–78, 133; Hook 2005.

Thyestes was one of the most popular subjects for both Greek and Latin tragedies.[14] *In* ***F 1d*** *Diogenes Laertius ascribes to Diogenes'* Thyestes *an argument justifying the consumption of human flesh (anthropophagy). This suggests that the play involved the best-known episode in Thyestes' story, in which he was tricked by his brother Atreus into eating the flesh of his own sons. The* Atreus *mentioned by Philodemus (**T 2**) as typifying Diogenes' presentation of 'ugly and unholy things' such as anthropophagy was probably the same play. There is no evidence for its plot or dramatic structure, but Diogenes Laertius's summary indicates that someone in the play subjected the conventional horror of anthropophagy to rationalistic criticisms and argued that the practice was neither unusual nor unnatural. The argument may have taken the form of a consolation to Thyestes after the event and need not have been meant as a positive recommendation of anthropophagy (as later hostile critics claimed) but rather to reconcile Thyestes to his experience through a correct understanding of its naturalness.*[15] *Hook argues further that in focusing on Thyestes' anthropophagy and Oedipus's incest Diogenes was responding specifically to Plato's treatment of these crimes as emblematic of tyrants and the tyrannical soul, which itself was suggested by the tragic tradition.*[16]

F 1d Diogenes Laertius 6.73

μηδέν τε ἄτοπον εἶναι ἐξ ἱεροῦ τι λαβεῖν ἢ τῶν ζῴων τινὸς γεύσασθαι· μηδὲ ἀνόσιον εἶναι τὸ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπείων κρεῶν ἅψασθαι, ὡς δῆλον ἐκ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων[615] ἐθῶν· καὶ τῷ δὲ ὀρθῷ λόγῳ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι καὶ διὰ πάντων εἶναι λέγων· καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἄρτῳ κρέως εἶναι καὶ ἐν τῷ λαχάνῳ ἄρτου, καὶ τῶν σωμά-

[14] See Vol. 1 pp. 156f. on Agathon's *Thyestes*. Note also Theodectas **F 9**, and on the Latin tragedies Tarrant 1985, 40–48.

[15] Döring (1993, 341 f.) suggests that the speaker was Atreus and the argument a parody of its philosophical models. This seems unlikely since we know that Diogenes' defence of anthropophagy and incest was both adopted by the early Stoics (Zeno and Chrysippus) and bitterly criticized by his and their opponents (»» Hook 2005).

[16] Similarly López Cruces–Campos Daroca 1998–99, 46 (on *Oedipus*); López Cruces 2003a, 66f.

THYESTES

Weber discussed two further possible testimonia to the play, the first previously identified in Nauck's first edition and both printed under Thyestes *in* TrGF. *The second-century Christian advocate Theophilus speaks in lurid terms of books by Zeno, Diogenes and Cleanthes recommending that fathers be boiled and eaten by their own children, 'and in addition a still more ungodly voice is found, that of Diogenes teaching children to bring their parents to sacrifice and consume them'.*[17] *And according to one of the spurious Epistles of Diogenes, 'One owes no gratitude to one's parents either for being born, since what exists comes into being naturally, nor for being as one is, for the blending of elementary particles (*stoicheia*) is responsible for that.'*[18] *Theophilus presumably gives a distorted version of an argument of Diogenes, but whether this was presented in* Thyestes *is uncertain since we know from Philodemus (**T 2** n.) that anthropophagy was also discussed in Diogenes'* Politeia *and in the dialogue* Philiscus. *The argument about gratitude to parents could have occurred anywhere (or nowhere) in the works of Diogenes; Weber ascribed it to* Thyestes *only because its appeal to 'the blending of elementary particles' resembles the reference to the blending of everything in everything in **F 1d** (see note below).*

F 1d Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers, Diogenes*

And (Diogenes held) that it is not at all improper to take something from a sanctuary or to feed on any animal; nor unholy to partake even of human flesh, as is clear from the practices of other peoples; arguing also that on a correct account everything is contained in everything and permeates everything: for in fact there is flesh in bread and an element of bread in vegetables, and something

[17] Theophilus, *To Autolycus* 3.5. . . . πρὸς τούτοις ἀθεωτέρα τις φωνὴ εὑρίσκεται, ἡ τοῦ Διογένους, διδάσκοντος τὰ τέκνα τοὺς ἑαυτῶν γονεῖς εἰς θυσίαν ἄγειν καὶ τούτους κατεσθίειν.

[18] [Diogenes], *Epist.* 21.1–3: γονεῦσι χάριτας οὐχ ἑκτέον οὔτε τοῦ γενέσθαι, ἐπεὶ φύσει γέγονε τὰ ὄντα, οὔτε τῆς ποιότητος· ἡ γὰρ τῶν στοιχείων σύγκρασις αἰτία ταύτης.

των τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πᾶσι διά τινων ἀδήλων πόρων καὶ ὄγκων εἰσκρινομένων καὶ συνατμιζομένων, ὡς δῆλον ἐν τῷ Θυέστῃ ποιεῖ, εἴ γε αὐτοῦ[620] αἱ τραγῳδίαι καὶ μὴ Φιλίσκου τοῦ Αἰγινήτου ἐκείνου γνωρίμου ἢ Πασιφῶντος τοῦ †λουκιανοῦ†, ὅν φησι Φαβωρῖνος ἐν Παντοδαπῇ ἱστορίᾳ μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν αὐτοῦ συγγράψαι.

616 τῷ δὲ ὀρθῷ Pearson τῶδε ὀρθῶ (i.e. τῷδε ὀρθῷ) mss. BPF τῷ ὀρθῷ δὲ recc. 617 κρέως B^2PF (λέγων . . . εἶναι om. B) κρέας Φ 618 ἄρτου BP ἄρτον FΦ λοιπῶν B λιτῶν PF 622 λουκιανοῦ Diog. Λουσιάτου Roeper Ἐρετριακοῦ Wilamowitz

ΜΗΔΕΙΑ

Weber 1887, 147; Döring 1993, 337f.; Noussia 2006, 234f.; Wright 2016a, 161.

*Only the title is directly attested (**T 1**), but Stobaeus's chapter 'On willingness to strive' includes a paraphrase attributed to Diogenes which may be related to the tragedy:*

> Diogenes said that Medea was wise but not a witch. She took effete men whose bodies were corrupted by luxury and gave them tough training in the gymnasia and steam-baths, and so made them strong with rude health. This led to the belief that she made them young by boiling them.[19]

Medea's rejuvenating powers, and especially the story that she pretended to rejuvenate Jason's persecutor Pelias by boiling him in a cauldron but allowed him to die instead, are well attested in classical literature and art (»» Gantz 1993, 365–67, Collard–Cropp 2008b, 60–63 on Euripides' Daughters of Pelias*). The episode might have been the subject of Diogenes' play, or it might have been mentioned in a later context such as the episode of Medea's infanticide. In any case Diogenes seems to have subverted the mythical accounts of Medea by turning her from a witch into an emblem of his own philosophy of virtue achieved through hardships and asceticism.*

[19] Stobaeus 3.29.92: Διογένους· ὁ Διογένης ἔλεγε τὴν Μήδειαν σοφήν, ἀλλ' οὐ φαρμακίδα γενέσθαι· λαμβάνουσαν γὰρ μαλακοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ τὰ σώματα διεφθαρμένους ὑπὸ τρυφῆς ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις καὶ τοῖς πυριατηρίοις διαπονεῖν καὶ ἰσχυροὺς ποιεῖν σφριγῶντας· ὅθεν περὶ αὐτῆς ῥυῆναι τὴν δόξαν, ὅτι τὰ κρέα ἕψουσα νέους ἐποίει. Wright (2016a, 161) notes that Palaephatus, *On Incredible Stories* 43 rationalizes the myth similarly, making Medea the inventor of steam-baths.

of the remaining substances in everything, as particles of them too penetrate and blend into them like vapour by way of certain imperceptible pores, as he makes clear in *Thyestes*, if indeed the tragedies are his and not by his associate Philiscus of Aegina or Pasiphon †*son of Lucianus*†, who Favorinus in his *Historical Miscellany* (fr. 72 Barigazzi/77 Amato) says composed them after his death.

MEDEA

Another text has been linked rather implausibly with Diogenes' play by Weber and others. Dio Chysostom's sixteenth oration, 'On Grief', counsels against allowing ourselves to be afflicted by grief and fear of suffering and ends as follows:

> They say that Jason anointed himself with a certain salve that he got from Medea and so, I suppose, suffered nothing from the dragon or from the fire-breathing bulls. This salve, then, we should get from Medea, that is from intelligence (*phronêsis*), and from now on scorn everything (i.e. all griefs and fears). Otherwise all will be fire for us, and all sleepless dragons.[20]

This does not refer to Diogenes, nor to a novel account of Medea and her salve that could be ascribed to him. It merely plays allegorically on the name Medea and the word μήδεα, 'wise counsels', as Dio or any orator or moralist might have done.

[20] Dio Chrys. 16.10: τὸν Ἰάσονά φασι χρισάμενον δυνάμει τινί, λαβόντα παρὰ τῆς Μηδείας, ἔπειτα οἶμαι μήτε παρὰ τοῦ δράκοντος μηδὲν παθεῖν μήτε ὑπὸ τῶν ταύρων τῶν τὸ πῦρ ἀναπνεόντων. ταύτην οὖν δεῖ κτήσασθαι τὴν δύναμιν παρὰ τῆς Μηδείας, τουτέστι τῆς φρονήσεως, λαβόντα, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἁπάντων καταφρονεῖν. εἰ δὲ μή, πάντα πῦρ ἡμῖν καὶ πάντα ἄϋπνοι δράκοντες.

ΟΙΔΙΠΟΥΣ

Weber 1887, 143–45, 148; von Fritz 1926, 87f.; Brancacci 1977, 168f.; López Cruces–Campos Daroca 1998–99; Goulet-Cazé 2003, 75–78, 133; Hook 2005; Noussia 2006, 233f.; Ventrella 2011; Wright 2016a, 158–60.

*Philodemus (**T 2**) names* Oedipus *as one of those works of Diogenes that justified 'ugly and unholy things', in this case certainly incest and probably patricide as well (patricide is included in Philodemus's summary of atrocities approved by Cynics,* On Stoics *col. 20.3f. Dorandi; cf. Theophilus cited above, p. 213 on* Thyestes*). Beyond that there is no direct evidence, but Weber plausibly identified elements of the play in Dio Chrysostom's tenth oration, 'Diogenes, or On House-slaves'. Here Diogenes meets a man searching for a fugitive slave and explains to him the foolishness, first, of wanting to recover a disloyal slave and secondly of consulting the Delphic oracle for advice on doing so: the man cannot expect to understand the god's advice when he does not even 'know himself', and if he takes the trouble to know himself he will no longer need the god's advice. To confirm the point Diogenes cites the case of Oedipus, who*

> did not go to Delphi seeking advice but ran into Tiresias and got great suffering from it through his ignorance of himself. He learned (i.e. from Tiresias) that he had had intercourse with his mother and had children by her; and then, when he should perhaps have concealed this or made it legal in Thebes, he first made it known to everyone and then complained bitterly and cried aloud that he was their father and their brother, and husband and son of the same woman. But cocks don't complain about these things, nor do dogs nor any ass; and neither do the Persians — and they are regarded as the finest men of Asia. And on top of all that he wandered blinded, as if he could not have wandered (i.e., like a normal Cynic) while keeping his sight.[21]

[21] *Or.* 10.29f.: [ὁ Οἰδίπους] εἰς Δελφοὺς μὲν οὐκ ἦλθε μαντευσόμενος, τῷ δὲ Τειρεσίᾳ συμβαλὼν μεγάλα κακὰ ἀπέλαυσε τῆς ἐκείνου μαντικῆς διὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἄγνοιαν. ἔγνω γὰρ ὅτι τῇ μητρὶ συνεγένετο καὶ παῖδές εἰσιν αὐτῷ ἐξ ἐκείνης· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, δέον ἴσως κρύπτειν τοῦτο ἢ ποιῆσαι νόμιμον τοῖς Θηβαίοις, πρῶτον μὲν πᾶσιν ἐποίησε φανερόν, ἔπειτα ἠγανάκτει καὶ ἐβόα μεγάλα, ὅτι τῶν αὐτῶν πατήρ ἐστι καὶ ἀδελφὸς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ καὶ υἱός. οἱ δὲ ἀλεκτρυόνες οὐκ ἀγανακτοῦσιν ἐπὶ τούτοις οὐδὲ οἱ κύνες οὐδὲ τῶν ὄνων οὐδείς, οὐδὲ οἱ Πέρσαι· καίτοι δοκοῦσι τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἄριστοι. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἐτύφλωσεν αὑτόν· ἔπειτα ἠλᾶτο τετυφλωμένος, ὥσπερ οὐ δυνάμενος βλέπων πλανᾶσθαι.

OEDIPUS

The man objects that Oedipus was surely unfortunate but still the wisest of men since he alone solved the riddle of the Sphinx. Diogenes replies:

> You're saying he solved the riddle? Haven't you heard that the Sphinx told him to recognize man?[22] But he neither said nor recognized what man is and thought he was answering the question merely by saying the name of man, just as if someone were asked 'What is Socrates?' and said no more than the name 'Socrates'. I once heard someone say that the Sphinx is ignorance. Well, that had been the ruin of the Boeotians both previously and now, preventing them from knowing anything as they are the most ignorant of men. Now the rest of them were somewhat more aware of their own stupidity, but Oedipus, having decided he was the wisest of men and had escaped the Sphinx, and having persuaded the other Boeotians of this, was most miserably ruined. For those who are ignorant but convinced they are wise are much more wretched than everyone else; and such is the breed of sophists.[23]

Weber's inference that this obviously Cynic critique of Oedipus's stupidity and self-harm was derived from Diogenes' Oedipus *is widely accepted,*[24] *but the design of the play remains unclear. López Cruces and Campos Daroca suggest that it dramatized Oedipus's encounter with the Sphinx and had a comic/satyric character like the satyr-play* Sphinx *in Aeschylus's Theban tetralogy; this Sphinx will have been a Socratic/*

---

[22] Not 'prompted him to give the answer 'man'' as in the much-quoted Loeb translation of J. W. Cohoon. The Sphinx posed the riddle; Oedipus recognized that man was the answer. Cf. López Cruces–Campos Daroca 62 n. 73.

[23] *Or.* 10.31f.: Μὴ γάρ, ἔφη, ἐκεῖνος ἔλυσε τὸ αἴνιγμα; οὐκ ἀκήκοας ὅτι ἄνθρωπον αὐτὸν ἐκέλευσε γνῶναι ἡ Σφίγξ; ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπον μὲν ὃ ἐστιν οὔτε εἶπεν οὔτε ἔγνω· τὸ δὲ ὄνομα τὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου λέγων ᾤετο λέγειν τὸ ἐρωτώμενον· ὥσπερ εἴ τις ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ἐστι Σωκράτης, ὁ δὲ μηδὲν εἴποι πλέον τοῦ ὀνόματος, ὅτι Σωκράτης. ἐγὼ δὲ ἤκουσά του λέγοντος ὅτι ἡ Σφὶγξ ἡ ἀμαθία ἐστίν. ταύτην οὖν καὶ πρότερον διαφθεῖραι τοὺς Βοιωτοὺς καὶ νῦν, οὐδὲν αὐτοὺς ἐῶσαν εἰδέναι, ἅτε ἀνθρώπων ἀμαθεστάτους. τοὺς μὲν οὖν ἄλλους μᾶλλόν τι αἰσθάνεσθαι τῆς αὑτῶν ἀνοίας, τὸν δὲ Οἰδίποδα, σοφώτατον ἡγησάμενον αὐτὸν εἶναι καὶ διαπεφευγέναι τὴν Σφίγγα καὶ πείσαντα τοὺς ἄλλους Θηβαίους τοῦτο, κάκιστα ἀπολέσθαι. ὅσοι γὰρ ἂν ἀμαθεῖς ὄντες πεισθῶσι σοφοὶ εἶναι, οὗτοι πολύ εἰσιν ἀθλιώτεροι τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων· καὶ ἔστι τοιοῦτον τὸ τῶν σοφιστῶν γένος.

[24] Noussia (2006, 233 n. 20) notes that the critique of Laius's stupidity and its consequences earlier in the same oration (10.24f.) might also be derived from *Oedipus*.

Diogenic figure, contradicting contemporary nomos*-based philosophies and expounding to Oedipus the Cynic view that 'man' is by nature (*phusei*) a combination of animal (quadruped), human (biped) and god (triped), rather than sequentially quadruped, biped and triped as in Oedipus's conventional response; and Oedipus will have accepted the Sphinx's wisdom and turned to a happy life as a Cynic wanderer. This is hard to reconcile with Dio's account, which presents Oedipus as a man who destroyed himself through ignorance and the Sphinx as the embodiment of that ignorance, which Oedipus mistakenly thought he had defeated and so unknowingly committed incest, then failed to accept this as natural when he learned of it and perversely blinded and exiled*

Incerta Fabula

F 1h Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 2.20.119.5f.

τί γὰρ ἕτερον ἡ τρυφὴ ἢ φιλήδονος λιχνεία καὶ πλεονασμὸς περίεργος πρὸς ἡδυπάθειαν ἀνειμένων; ἐμφαντικῶς ὁ Διογένης ἔν τινι τραγῳδίᾳ γράφει·

οἱ τῆς ἀνάνδρου καὶ διεσκατωμένης
τρυφῆς ὑφ' ἡδοναῖσι σαχθέντες κέαρ
πονεῖν θέλοντες οὐδὲ βαιά,

καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις ὅσα αἰσχρῶς μὲν εἴρηται, ἐπαξίως δὲ τῶν φιληδόνων.

Fragmenta Dubia

These fragments are questionably ascribed to tragedies of Diogenes or other Cynics because of their content. See above, p. 205 and notes on ***[F 2]–[F 7]*** *below.*

[F 2] *Gnomologium Vaticanum* no. 97 Sternbach; line 1 often quoted elsewhere with or without reference to Diogenes (see note below).

ὁ αὐτὸς (*sc.* Ἀλέξανδρος) ἰδὼν Διογένην κοιμώμενον ἐν πίθῳ εἶπε *πίθε μεστὲ φρενῶν*, ὁ δὲ φιλόσοφος ἀποστὰς εἶπεν· *Ὦ βασιλεῦ μέγιστε*,

θέλω τύχης σταλαγμὸν ἢ φρενῶν πίθον,
ἧς μὴ παρούσης δυστυχοῦσιν αἱ φρένες.

himself. More probably the critique was addressed to Oedipus after his catastrophe, as seems likely for Thyestes*. Ventrella suggests on this basis that the play was essentially dialectical, presenting a retrospective demolition of Oedipus's 'sophistic' (and Platonic) solution of the Sphinx's riddle and then his recognition of his true human nature, acceptance of his incest and happy conversion to a Cynic mode of life. This too takes us some distance from Dio's conclusion that Oedipus 'was most miserably ruined', and from the play's character as a tragedy. If Oedipus was offered a Cynic critique of his catastrophe this was more likely a consolation than a cure.*

Unidentified Play

F 1h Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*

What else is luxury but pleasure-loving gluttony and superfluous excess of those who seek enjoyment without restraint? Diogenes writes forcefully in some tragedy:

> . . . those in thrall to pleasures, their hearts stuffed with unmanly, filth-smeared luxury, unwilling to endure even small labours . . .

and what follows, grossly expressed but fittingly for lovers of pleasure.

Doubtful Fragments

[F 2] Vatican gnomology (14th C. AD)

The same (i.e. Alexander the Great), seeing Diogenes sleeping in a pithos, said, 'Pithos, full of intelligence'; and the philosopher disavowing it said, 'O very great king,

> I prefer a drop of fortune to an urnful of intelligence. Without that, intelligence can never prosper.'

F 3? (= adesp. F 374 N^2)

(a) Cassius Dio 47.49.1–2 (and Byzantine derivatives)

ὁ οὖν Βροῦτος . . . ἀπογνοὺς μὲν τὴν σωτηρίαν, ἀπαξιώσας δὲ τὴν ἅλωσιν ἐς τὸν θάνατον καὶ αὐτὸς κατέφυγεν· καὶ ἀναβοήσας τοῦτο δὴ τὸ Ἡράκλειον,

ὦ τλῆμον ἀρετή, λόγος ἄρ᾽ ἦσθ᾽, ἐγὼ δέ σε
ὡς ἔργον ἤσκουν· σὺ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἐδούλευες τύχῃ,

παρεκάλεσέ τινα τῶν συνόντων, ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνῃ.

(b) Plutarch, *Moralia* 165a–b

πάλιν οἵονταί τινες εἶναι σῶμα τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν κακίαν· αἰσχρὸν ἴσως τὸ ἀγνόημα, θρήνων δὲ καὶ ὀδυρμῶν οὐκ ἄξιον. ἀλλ᾽ αἵτινές εἰσι τοιαῦται κρίσεις καὶ ὑπολήψεις,

ὦ τλῆμον ἀρετή, λόγος ἄρ᾽ ἦσθ᾽, ἐγὼ δέ σε
ὡς ἔργον ἤσκουν,

ἀφεὶς τὴν *πλουτοποιὸν ἀδικίαν* καὶ τὴν *γόνιμον ἀπάσης ἡδονῆς ἀκολασίαν*, ταύτας ἄξιόν ἐστιν οἰκτίρειν ὁμοῦ καὶ δυσχεραίνειν . . .

[F 4] (= adesp. F 284 N^2) Diogenes Laertius 6.38, ~ Aelian, *Var. Hist.* 3.29; v. 1 Julian, *Or.* 9.14 (see **[F 4]** n.) and *Or.* 6.4 (ἄπολιν, ἄοικον κτλ); v. 2 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* no. 201 Sternbach

εἰώθει δὲ λέγειν ⟨πάσας⟩ τὰς τραγικὰς ἀρὰς αὐτῷ συνηντηκέναι· εἶναι γοῦν

ἄπολις, ἄοικος, πατρίδος ἐστερημένος,
πτωχός, πλανήτης, βίον ἔχων ἐφήμερον.

1–2 ἄπολις, ἄοικος . . . πτωχός, πλανήτης Diog., Julian πλάνης ἄοικος . . . πτωχὸς δυσείμων Aelian 2 ἐφήμερον Gnom. Vat. τοὐφ᾽ ἡμέραν Diog. τὸν ἐφήμερον Aelian

[F 5] (= adesp. F 394 N^2) Plutarch, *Moralia* 632e

ποιεῖ δ᾽ εὖχαρι σκῶμμα καὶ μέμψις ἐμφαίνουσα χάριν, ὡς Διογένης περὶ Ἀντισθένους ἔλεγεν,

ὅς με ῥάκη τ᾽ ἤμπισχε κἀξηνάγκασεν
πτωχὸν γενέσθαι κἀκ δόμων ἀνάστατον.

οὐ γὰρ ἂν ὁμοίως πιθανὸς ἦν λέγων ‘ὅς με σοφὸν καὶ αὐτάρκη καὶ μακάριον ἐποίησε’.

F 3?

(a) Cassius Dio, *Roman Histories*

Brutus therefore . . . despairing of survival and refusing to accept capture took refuge himself in death, and crying out these words of Heracles,

> O wretched virtue, so you were only a word, while I practised you as something real — but you, it appears, were a slave to fortune!

he called on one of those with him to dispatch him.

(b) Plutarch, *On Superstition*

Again, some people think that that virtue and vice are substances. Their ignorance is perhaps disgraceful but is not worth moaning and lamenting about. But judgments and notions like these,

> O wretched virtue, so you were only a word, while I practised you as something real,

dismissing *wealth-making injustice* and *licentiousness which gives birth to all pleasure*, these we should pity and resent . . . .

[F 4] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers, Diogenes*

He (i.e. Diogenes) used to say that all the tragic curses had fallen upon him; he was, at any rate,

> Cityless, homeless, bereft of fatherland, a beggar, a vagrant, getting a living day by day.

[F 5] Plutarch, *Sympotic Questions*

A complaint that implies gratitude also makes an elegant jibe, as Diogenes used to say about Antisthenes,

> who clothed me with rags and compelled me to become a beggar, uprooted from my home.

He would not have been so engaging if he had said, ‘who made me wise and self-sufficient and blessed’.

[F 6] (= adesp. F 522 N^2) Stobaeus 3.17.5 (ms. S only, attached to Soph. *OT* 1410)

ὅσοι δὲ φιλοσοφοῦντες ἐκμοχθοῦσί τι,
ἐνταῦθ' ὑπάρχει τῷ βίῳ γαστρὸς κρατεῖν·
διδάσκαλος γὰρ ηὐτέλεια τῶν σοφῶν
καὶ τῶν ἀρίστων γίγνεται βουλευμάτων.

[F 7] (= adesp. F 546 N^2) Stobaeus 4.33.17 (attached to Eur. F 285)

ἐγὼ γάρ, εἰ νοῦν εἶχ' ἔμ' ὁ σπείρας πατήρ,
ἠπιστάμην ἂν μουσικὴν παρεὶς πονεῖν,
ὡς εὐτυχήσων καὶ κακῶς πράξων ποτέ.
πρῶτον μέν, ἐξ ὧν πάντα γίγνεται βροτοῖς,
εὔογκος εἶναι γαστρὶ μὴ πληρουμένῃ
στέργειν θ' ὑδρηροῖς ὥστε θὴρ ἀεὶ ποτοῖς,
χειμῶνί τ' ἀσκεῖν σῶμα θερμά θ' ἡλίου
τοξεύματ' αἰνεῖν μὴ σκιατραφούμενος.
νῦν δ' οὐκ ἐθισθεὶς ταῦτ' ἐπίσταμαι μὲν οὔ,
φέρειν δ' ἀνάγκη· τὸν γὰρ Ὀρφέα λαβὼν
ἅπαν τε Μουσῶν ἐννεάφθογγον μέλος,
οὐκ ἂν πίθοιμι γαστέρ', ἀλλὰ δεῖ βίου.

[F 6] Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On self-control'

> Those who strive to attain something through philosophy learn from it to live with their stomachs under control. Frugality is a teacher of wisdom and of those decisions that are best.

[F 7] Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'Poverty compared with wealth'

> If my father who begot me had had good sense, I would have rejected the arts and learned to toil, as I could expect to see good times and bad: first, the basis of everything for mortals, to be the right size with an unstuffed stomach, and always content to drink water like a beast and to exercise my body in winter and accept the Sun's hot shafts, not keeping to the shade. But now I'm unused to these things and don't know how to bear them, yet bear them I must. Even with Orpheus and the whole nine-voiced Muses' song, I could not persuade my stomach — it needs food!

NOTES ON DIOGENES OF SINOPE

T 1, T 2, T 3
See Introduction above (pp. 203–5) on the tragedies attributed to Diogenes and the question of their authenticity.

T 2
Philodemus's *On the Stoics* is partially preserved in two Herculaneum papyri, reedited with analysis and commentary by Dorandi 1982. In the best preserved part (its conclusion) the Epicurean attacks those Stoics of his own time (1st C. BC) who wanted to disown some of the Cynic-influenced ethical doctrines propounded in the *Politeia (Republic)* of Zeno of Citium, who founded the Stoic school at Athens in the early third century and was originally a follower of Diogenes' successor Crates of Thebes. Amongst other arguments, Philodemus insists on the authenticity both of Zeno's *Politeia* and of the *Politeia* of Diogenes whose disreputable doctrines, he argues, Zeno perpetuated.[25] Philodemus's work concludes with a list of such doctrines including patricide, anthropophagy, rejection of *polis* communities and laws, and all kinds of sexual perversion. The Cynic tenets attributed by ancient sources to Diogenes, Zeno and his successors (especially Chrysippus) are set out in detail in Goulet-Cazé

[25] The same topic appears briefly in Philodemus's history of the Stoic school (P. Herc. 1018, ed. Dorandi, 1994, col. 4).

2003, 9–60 (with summary table pp. 57–58), their reliability evaluated *ibid.* 61–72 (see 61–68 on Philodemus's partisan exaggerations), and actual Cynic doctrines discussed *ibid.* 73–82.

T 2 contains one of Philodemus's arguments for the authenticity of Diogenes' *Politeia*, i.e. that the same doctrines appear in other works of Diogenes, in the tragedies *Atreus* and *Oedipus* and in the dialogue *Philiscus* (for which see Sotion's list in **T 1**). For the implications of this regarding the authenticity of the tragedies see above, p. 204. Philodemus presents *Atreus* and *Oedipus* as obvious examples, so *Atreus* is probably the tragedy otherwise known as *Thyestes.* Thyestes and Oedipus together often exemplify tragic suffering or perversion.

T 3

From two of the discourses in which Julian defends the original teachings of the early Cynics against the debased forms of Cynicism current in his own day. The disreputable works ascribed to Diogenes and Crates, he argues, are either inauthentic or were not meant seriously; either way, they are not valid evidence for their actual teachings. Julian thus has his cake and eats it, leaving the impression that the tragedies ascribed to Diogenes were really forged by Philiscus while admitting that they might be (negligible) works of Diogenes himself. On this question of authorship see above, p. 203f.

Julian's discourse *Against Heraclius* is mainly concerned with contemporary Cynics' misuse of **deceptive fictions**, i.e. myths, in their public teaching. The Cynic **Oenomaus** whom he attacks so bitterly is Plutarch's contemporary Oenomaus of Gadara. The Suda (*οι* 123) lists several philosophical titles, and Eusebius's *Preparation for the Gospel* (5.19–36, 6.7) quotes long extracts from his attack on religious impostures, *Exposing the Swindlers* or *Against the Oracles*. Only Julian says that he wrote tragedies (*TrGF* no. 188). He and Diogenes are jointly confused with the tragedian Diogenes of Athens in Suda *δ* 1142 (= *TrGF* 45 **T 1**: Vol. 1, p. 236).

F 1d

See the introduction to *Thyestes*, pp. 212f. above. Text and interpretation of lines 616–20 (**καὶ τῷ δὲ ὀρθῷ λόγῳ . . . συνατμιζομένων**) are discussed in detail by Donzelli 1965, cf. Goulet-Cazé 2003, 34 n. 92. López Cruces (2003, 64) identifies the speaker as Atreus, implausibly. **as is clear from the practices of other peoples:** cf. Diogenes on the Persians' acceptance of incest as quoted by Dio Chrysostom (above, p. 216). Comparisons between Greek and barbarian *nomoi* were long-established in Greek thought and convenient for the Cynics' insistence on living 'according to nature' as barbarians could be considered more primitive and therefore more natural. **everything is contained in everything etc.:** this evokes the doctrine of Anaxagoras (esp. B 1–6, 11–12 DK), according to which the material things in our cosmos are formed from the rapid rotation of

an undifferentiated mass of basic ingredients (ἀρχαί); each thing has some dominant ingredient(s) which determines its material character, but no ingredient is entirely absent, however imperceptible it may be: »» Curd 2010, 14–25, 178–91. **they penetrate and blend into them etc.:** this alludes to the idea (separate from Anaxagoras's) that material substances react and combine with each other and are perceptible because they contain spaces and passages (πόροι, **pores**) through which minute particles can migrate from one substance to another. The idea can be traced to Empedocles and was adopted by the atomists: see e.g. Plato, *Meno* 76c–d (= Empedocles A 92 DK), Aristotle, *On Coming to be etc.* 324b26ff. (= Empedocles A 87, Leucippus A 7 DK). **if indeed the tragedies are his etc.:** see above, pp. 203f. on the authorship of the tragedies. **Pasiphon †*son of Lucianus*†:** this may be the Pasiphon who was a member of Menedemus's school of philosophy at Eretria and was said by the Stoic Persaeus to have written most of the Socratic dialogues usually attributed to Aeschines of Sphettus (cf. Diogenes Laertius 2.61: »» von Fritz 1949). The Latin-based patronymic is impossible for a late 4th-century Greek but is not easily corrected (cf. Amato 2010, 322 n. 757): Roeper (1848, 62) suggested Λουσιάτου, i.e. from Lousoi in Arcadia (cf. Xen. *Anab*. 7.6.40, Polyb. 4.18.11, Steph. Byz. λ 90 Billerbeck); Wilamowitz (1881, 142 n. 13a) Ἐρετριακοῦ, 'the Eretrian' (see above).

F 1h

For the rejection of physical and worldly pleasures in favour of a life of virtuous toil (*ponos*) see especially Prodicus's *Choice of Heracles* (recounted by Socrates in Xen. *Mem.* 2.21–34)[26] and in tragedy Eur. *Alexander* F 54 ('Wealth and excessive luxury are a bad sort of training for manliness'), *Archelaus* F 235–239, and the debate on active vs. quiet lives in *Antiope*, esp. F 187, 193, 196, 198, also F 1043, F 1052.3ff. 'Manliness' and 'unmanliness' (*euandria, anandria*) are moral as well as physical terms in these contexts (»» Karamanou 2017, 221f.). This is the only text-fragment explicitly ascribed to a tragedy of Diogenes, but it gives an incomplete impression of his teaching. For Diogenes, toil (*ponos*) and the endurance of physical hardships were an essential part of the moral training needed for a life 'in accordance with nature' (*kata phusin*), free from conventional needs and constraints and invulnerable to the vicissitudes of fortune (»» Goulet-Cazé 1986, 53–71, 220–22; 2017, 239, 247f.).

The language of the verses is intentionally crude: διασκατόω, lit. 'cover with excrement', is unique and perhaps invented by Diogenes. σάττω is used in the herald's speech, Aesch. *Ag.* 644 (τοιῶνδε . . . πημάτων σεσαγμένοι, 'loaded

[26] On *ponos* see also Antisthenes in Diogenes Laertius 6.2, καὶ ὅτι ὁ πόνος ἀγαθὸν συνέστησε διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου Ἡρακλέους καὶ τοῦ Κύρου, 'And he [Antisthenes] established that toil is a good thing in the *Great Heracles* and the *Cyrus*'.

with such afflictions') but otherwise almost exclusively in iambus, comedy and prose. The repeated σ-sounds in lines 1–2 add to the vehement tone as in e.g. Eur. *Med.* 476 (see Mastronarde's note), *Ion* 386.

[F 2]

The first verse appears often in late classical and Byzantine sources, usually without attribution, as a proverb or an example of ἤ used disjunctively (»» Sternbach *ad loc.*); and often translated as a proverb in later European literature (»» Tosi 1991, 239f.; 1995, 945 n. 17; 2017, 732). Gregory Nazianzenus quotes line 1 anecdotally with a response (*Carm. Mor.* 39, col. 967.11 Migne): 'Some gold-lover once said, *I prefer a drop of luck to a pithos of intelligence*. To which some thought-lover replied, *A drop of intelligence for me rather than a depth of luck*';[27] the response is mistakenly attached to Diogenes' verse in some of the grammatical sources. Ps.-Nonnus (4.26), explaining another mention of Diogenes by Gregory (*Or.* 4, col. 596.7 Migne), ascribes line 1 to 'the philosopher Sotates' (i.e. the poet Sotades) replying to Ptolemy II, and quotes a different response of Diogenes to Alexander ('Move over a bit so I can warm up (i.e. get some direct sun)').

Nauck attributed line 1 and possibly line 2 to an unidentified tragedy of Diogenes. *TrGF* prints both, and Tosi (1995, 945) attributes them tentatively to *Heracles*, followed by López Cruces (2010, 14). But the tradition is entirely anecdotal and highly confused (»» Packmohr 1913, 39–42), so any attribution to Diogenes is doubtful and attribution to a tragedy still more so. That τύχη determines human fortunes is a conventional thought (e.g. Agathon **F 6, 8, 20**, Critias(?) **F 10**, Patrocles **F 1**, Carcinus II **F 4**, Chaeremon **F 2, 19**), but as Packmohr pointed out, the undervaluing of intelligence and right thinking in this couplet contradicts Diogenes' teaching that the assaults of fortune should be overcome by reason (e.g. Diogenes Laertius 6.38 ἔφασκε δ' ἀντιτιθέναι τύχῃ μὲν θάρσος, νόμῳ δὲ φύσιν, πάθει δὲ λόγον, 'He said that he opposed courage to fortune, nature to convention, reason to emotion'; 6.63 ἐρωτηθεὶς τί αὐτῷ περιγέγονεν ἐκ φιλοσοφίας, ἔφη, καὶ εἰ μηδὲν ἄλλο, τὸ γοῦν πρὸς πᾶσαν τύχην παρεσκευάσθαι, 'When asked what he had gained from philosophy, he said 'If nothing else, at any rate to be prepared for every turn of fortune').

F 3?

Neither source names Diogenes: see above, pp. 210f. for the possible attribution to his *Heracles* and possible dramatic context. **O wretched virtue:** 'wretched' in the sense of 'pitiful', but **τλῆμον** can mean 'patient, enduring' and may also

[27] ἔφησέ τίς που τῶν φιλοχρύσων τάδε· | Θέλω τύχης σταλαγμὸν ἢ φρενῶν πίθον. | πρὸς ὅν τις ἀντέφησε τῶν φιλοφρόνων· | Ῥανὶς φρενῶν μοι μᾶλλον ἢ βυθὸς τύχης.

evoke Heracles' fortitude in pursuing his labours in the name of virtue. For the supremacy of **fortune** see above on **[F 2]**.

Dio's quotation makes Heracles' meaning clear: his virtue has failed to protect him against overwhelming misfortune. Plutarch however quotes the couplet without identifying the speaker and without its last few words (**you . . . were a slave to fortune**), and adds the references to ***wealth-making injustice*** and ***licentiousness which gives birth to all pleasure,*** as if this was an invitation to abandon virtue and embrace immorality. The quotation, isolated from its dramatic context, has thus become part of a tendentious attack on the Epicurean doctrine that pleasure is the only real value (»» Tosi 1995, 939–42). The iambic metre and diction of these phrases indicate a tragic source. Wilamowitz (1925, 304f.) and Snell (*TrGF*) ascribed them to a continuation of Heracles' speech, but that is quite uncertain as Tosi points out. The dramatic context would probably not have required Heracles to question his dedication to virtue in this way.

[F 4]

The sources say that Diogenes used these tragic verses paradoxically to display his self-sufficiency (*autarkeia*): he lived as a wandering beggar yet lacked nothing. Satyrus (fr. 2 Schorn) recorded his nickname ἡμερόβιος, 'Living-by-the-day', and may have quoted these verses to illustrate it. Ascription to a tragedy is hardly justified. Diogenes might have quoted from an earlier tragedy or patched them together from more than one tragedy. The verse interpolated at Eur. *Hipp.* 1029 (ἄπολις ἄοικος, φυγὰς ἀλητεύων χθόνα, 'cityless, homeless, an exile wandering the earth) itself recycles *Hipp.* 1048 φυγὰς ἀλητεύων χθονός. The anecdotal tradition often has Diogenes wittily quoting or adapting poetic verses, e.g. Eur. *IT* 253 (Plut. *Mor.* 602a), *Med.* 410, *Pho.* 40, *Antiope* F 200.1–2 (Diog. Laert. 6.36, 6.55, 6.104): »» Packmohr 1913, 27–70, Sluiter 2005, 157, Usher 2009, Lupi 2017. For ascription to Diogenes see e.g. Wilamowitz 1893, 18, Snell in *TrGF*; against it, Packmohr 1913, 60–63. More recently Noussia (2006, 235f.) ascribes the verses tentatively to a character in a tragedy of Diogenes, López Cruces and Campos Daroca (1998–99, 61) suggest Diogenes quoted from an earlier tragedy in his own *Oedipus*, and Lupi 2017 proposes attribution to Euripides' *Telephus* (or possibly Eur. *Oedipus*). Wright (2016a, 163) is more cautious.

[Julian, *Or.* 9.14 quotes line 1 with what seems to be a comic continuation, οὐκ ὀβολόν, οὐ δραχμήν, οὐκ οἰκέτην ἔχων | ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μᾶζαν . . . , 'not possessing an obol, not a drachma, not a servant, nor even a barley-cake . . . '. Kock printed all three verses as com. adesp. fr. 127. They are not included in *PCG*.**]**

[F 5]

Plutarch says that Diogenes 'used to say' these verses about Antisthenes, who first inspired him to devote himself to philosophy and the ascetic life. Like **[F 4]**

they are probably from an earlier tragedy which Diogenes may have applied humorously to himself (cf. Nauck 1889, 808; Lupi 2017 suggests Euripides' *Telephus* or *Oedipus* as for **[F 4]**). Less probably they are from one of Diogenes' tragedies and were interpreted as self-referential in the biographical tradition (Stephanopoulos 1988b, 19 suggests Diogenes' *Oedipus*).

[F 6]

The verses are attached to Soph. *OT* 1410 in Stobaeus and thus have no attribution; they are not necessarily tragic.[28] They give a Cynic twist to the general association of poverty with wisdom (cf. on Critias **F 25** in Vol. 1): the Cynic philosopher accepts the discipline of **frugality** (***εὐτέλεια***) and by suppressing his cruder appetites enables himself to become wise. For Diogenes' devotion to *euteleia* see e.g. Diog. Laert. 6.21, 6.37. His follower Crates of Thebes composed a *Hymn to Euteleia* which began: Χαῖρε, θεὰ δέσποινα, σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀγάπημα, | Εὐτελίη, κλεινῆς ἔγγονε Σωφροσύνης· | σὴν ἀρετὴν τιμῶσιν, ὅσοι τὰ δίκαι' ἀσκοῦσιν, 'Hail, divine mistress, cherished by the wise, Frugality, daughter of renowned Moderation! Those who practice justice honour your excellence' (*Anth.Pal.* 10.104 = *SH* no. 361). Controlling the stomach (**γαστρὸς κρατεῖν**) was a basic ethical requirement, e.g. [Pythagoras], *Golden Verses* 9–11 (κρατεῖν δ' εἰθίζεο τῶνδε, γαστρὸς μὲν πρώτιστα . . .), Menand. Monost. 137, 607 Jaekel = Pernigotti, Eur. *Supp.* 865f., F 413.4f. The maxim παχεῖα γαστὴρ (or γαστὴρ παχεῖα) λεπτὸν οὐ τίκτει νόον, 'a dense stomach does not beget subtle thought', is cited anonymously in late Greek sources and translated in Jerome, *Ep.* 52.11, *pinguis venter non gignit sensum tenuem* (»» Tosi 1995, 945f. comparing other Greek and Latin adaptations and suggesting that this too may have originated in a Cynic tragedy). **2. learn from it etc.:** lit. 'in it (i.e. the practice of philosophy) controlling the stomach subsists for their life'. The stomach proverbially represents the most fundamental and distracting physical need, e.g. *Odyssey* 7.218, 17.286, Hes. *Theog.* 26 (see West's note), Eur. F 49, F 201, F 915. **3. frugality**: εὐτέλεια as opposed to πολυτέλεια 'extravagance'. **wisdom:** lit. 'those things that are wise', cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 431, Eur. F 492.3.

[F 7]

The speaker complains that his father did not educate him in the Cynic way of life. He did not learn to reject idle pastimes such as music and poetry and to practice *askêsis*, embracing toil so as not be vulnerable to fortune (2–3, cf. **F 1h** n.), controlling his stomach (4–5, cf. **[F 6]** n.), drinking only water as beasts do (6) and exposing himself to the rigours of cold and heat (7–8). So now, being

[28] Wilamowitz (1893, 18) ascribed them to a Cynic tragedy. Gomme on Thuc. 2.40.1 thought them more likely comic. López Cruces 2003b ascribes them to an otherwise unattested Cynic *Antiope*: see next footnote.

unused to these things, he is at their mercy; all his musical training is of no help in suppressing his hunger (9–12). O. Crusius (1890, 702) noted the Cynic content of this speech, and Wilamowitz (1893, 192) ascribed it explicitly to a Cynic tragedy, as do Goulet-Cazé (1986, 220–22) and López Cruces (2003b).[29] But while the speech obviously alludes to Cynic doctrine it can hardly be from a tragedy of Diogenes or anyone else. The speaker says only that he regrets not having had a Cynic education and consequently being unable to control his hunger. The tone is comic, although the style is mock-tragic, especially in lines 10–11 (cf. Eur. *Alc.* 357 εἰ δ' Ὀρφέως μοι γλῶσσα καὶ μέλος παρῆν, *Med.* 543 μήτ' Ὀρφέως κάλλιον ὑμνῆσαι μέλος, *IA* 1211 εἰ μὲν τὸν Ὀρφέως εἶχον, ὦ πάτερ, λόγον, πείθειν ἐπάιδουσ' . . .). The poetically phrased **whole nine-voiced Muses' song**, i.e. song of all nine Muses, is illustrated by Vahlen 1899, 266f.

Appendix

Philiscus of Aegina (*TrGF* 89), Crates of Thebes (*TrGF* 90)

We have met ***Philiscus*** *as an alleged author of the tragedies attributed to Diogenes and probably a character in his dialogue* Philiscus *(above, pp. 203f. with Diogenes* ***T 1–3, F 1d****). According to Diogenes Laertius, probably drawing on Satyrus's biography of Diogenes, Diogenes had charmed Philiscus's brother Androsthenes, then Philiscus himself, and finally their father Onesicritus into joining his circle.*[30] *One of the Suda's two entries for this Philiscus (*φ *362) merely repeats this anecdote (the rest is about Diogenes) while the other (*φ *359) states that he himself wrote dialogues including a* Codrus *and (implausibly) that he taught Alexander the Great to read and write. Philiscus was easily confused with others of the same name, especially the Middle Comedy poet Philiscus (*PCG *VII.356–59), Isocrates' pupil Philiscus of Miletus and the Alexandrian poet and tragedian Philicus of Corcyra (below, pp. 300–4). For details and analysis of the testimonia see especially Schorn 2004, 158–61.*

---

[29] López Cruces attributes the speech to Amphion in an otherwise unknown Cynic *Antiope* in which the Euripidean hero was redefined as a model of the 'civilized' self-indulgence and demagoguery promoted in Athenian elite education, and Zethus (speaker of **[F 6]**) converted his brother to the hardy Cynic lifestyle; **[F 7**], then shows us Amphion deciding to abandon his musical art and embrace the life of *askêsis*. In fact nothing in **[F 7]** suggests that the speaker is involved in a debate or making a decision; and it would be surprising if Amphion complained that his peasant foster-father had failed to give him a Cynic education (while presumably doing so for his twin brother).

[30] Diog. Laert. 75–76 (≈ Philiscus T 1 in *TrGF*). This Onesicritus is wrongly identified with the Alexander historian Onesicritus of Astypalaea (»» Theodectas **F 17** n.) in Diog. Laert. 6.84.

If Philiscus was not the author of Diogenes' tragedies there is no clear evidence that he wrote tragedies at all.[31] *Meineke asserted that the* Themistocles *listed with other titles in the Suda's entry for the comic poet (φ 357 = Philiscus T 5? in* TrGF*) must really have been a tragedy (like the* Themistocles *of Moschion: below, pp. 244f.),*[32] *but even if that is so the poet will probably have been the better known Philicus of Corcyra. Pliny's statement that Protogenes of Caunus painted a portrait of 'Philiscus writer of tragedies meditating' (Plin.* NH *35 = Philiscus T 4* in TrGF*) can hardly refer to him since he was not primarily 'a writer of tragedies' (again this is more likely Philicus).*[33] *A single couplet quoted by Stobaeus (3.29.40) is printed as his in* TrGF *(89 F 1):*

> οὐκ ἔστιν, ὦ μάταιε, σὺν ῥᾳθυμίᾳ
> τὰ τῶν πονούντων μὴ πονήσαντας λαβεῖν.
>
> It's not possible, you fool, for people to stay idle and get without working what belongs to those who work.

The lemma however is simply 'Philiscus' and the fragment is more likely from the comic poet (= Philiscus fr. dub. 4 PCG*).*[34]

Crates of Thebes *was a more influential successor of Diogenes and teacher of Zeno of Citium who went on to found the Stoic school. The only evidence that Crates wrote tragedies is a statement of Diogenes Laertius (6.98): 'He also wrote tragedies with a most elevated philosophical character, for example the following:*

> οὐχ εἷς πάτρα μοι πύργος, οὐ μία στέγη,
> πάσης δὲ χέρσου καὶ πόλισμα καὶ δόμος
> ἕτοιμος ἡμῖν ἐνδιαιτᾶσθαι πάρα.
>
> No one stronghold is my fatherland, no one dwelling. Every land provides a city and home for me to abide in.'

---

[31] Schorn observes (159, 161) that he might have written tragedies of his own, which might be why he was thought to have written those of Diogenes.

[32] Meineke 1830, 58 = 1839, 424.

[33] Cf. *SEHT* II.735f. with comments on Protogenes' Dionysian connections.

[34] Wilamowitz (1912, 550 n. 1) noted that the only other citation of a Philiscus in Stobaeus is definitely comic (4.22.177, Φιλίσκου Φιλαργύρων). Hense's reason for suggesting Philiscus of Aegina for Stob. 3.29.40 was that the Cynics valued toil (*ponos*: similarly Kotlińska-Toma 73), but that is obviously inadequate (cf. Schramm 1929, 24); Nauck had opted for either the comic poet or Philicus. Schorn (2004, 159) adds that the verses could be from one of the tragedies of Diogenes that Philiscus was said to have written, but it is unlikely that those ever circulated under Philiscus's name.

This sentiment is characteristic of Cynic philosophy (though not confined to Cynics),[35] *and the verses seem to adapt a couplet ascribed to Heracles in Plutarch's* On Exile*, probably from an unidentified tragedy (Plut.* Mor. *600f*, TrGF *adesp. F 392):*

> Ἀργεῖος ἢ Θηβαῖος· οὐ γὰρ εὔχομαι
> μιᾶς· ἅπας μοι πύργος Ἑλλήνων πατρίς.
>
> Argive or Theban, I acknowledge not just one: every stronghold of the Hellenes is my fatherland.

Diogenes Laertius's information was generally accepted up to the late nineteenth century,[36] *and Dümmler assigned both fragments to a single speech in a Heracles-tragedy of Crates.*[37] *Wilamowitz seems to have accepted the ascription of the three verses to Heracles in a tragedy of Crates but pointed out that they cannot be from the same source as adesp. F 392 since they adapt their model to a Cynic ideal: Plutarch's Heracles calls himself a citizen of all Greece, but Crates' Heracles is a citizen of all the world.*[38] *Snell went a step further, printing the three verses as* TrGF *90 (Crates?)* ***F 1*** *but suggesting in a note that Crates probably did not write tragedies at all.*

*Most of the extant fragments of Crates' poetry (*SH *347–361) come from humorous Cynic adaptations of traditional epic and elegiac models, none probably of much length. The rest, in iambics (*SH *362–367), are epigrammatic statements of Cynic teaching, two of them first-person statements by Crates himself (*SH *365, 366). The supposedly tragic* ***F 1*** *(*SH *364) could well have been similar, i.e. an adaptation of Heracles' words in adesp. F 392 but now the words of Crates himself proclaiming the Cynic ideal (Diogenes* ***[F 4]*** *and* ***[F 5]*** *would in my opinion be comparable). The idea that the verses originated in a tragedy of Crates might then have been an inference from their seemingly tragic character.*

Scholars recently have accepted the ascription of the verses to a tragedy of Crates with some caution, e.g. Döring 1993, 346f., Goulet-Cazé in New Pauly *'Crates [4]' (cf. Goulet-Cazé 2017, 268 n. 25). Noussia in a detailed analysis assumes that the speaker was 'a proto-Cynic Heracles' (2006, 240). The question remains open, but if Crates did write 'tragedies' they were probably of an unconventional kind and similar to those of Diogenes as I understand them.*

---

[35] »» Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 160f. with a range of examples.

[36] The verses are Crates F 1 in Nauck 1889, along with three other quotations of Crates in Stobaeus which were arbitrarily assigned to his tragedies.

[37] Dümmler 1882, 68f., accepted by Weber 1887, 237f.

[38] Wilamowitz 1893, 19: *ille Hercules instat: Ἀργεῖος ἢ Θηβαῖος . . . (etc.). audimus τὸν κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων εὐεργέτην, qui non unius urbis aut gentis est, sed Graecus est . . . at Crateteus hunc παρῳδεῖ, nam cynicus κοσμοπολίτης est.*

SOSIPHANES I
(*TrGF* 92)

Texts etc. Schramm 1929, 6–15; *TrGF* 1[2].261–63 with *addenda* 5.1113; *MusTr* 196–99, 295; Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 54–63.

Discussions. Jacoby 1903, 459–61 and on *FGrH* 239 B 15, 22 (vol. IIB.2, p. 701); Nicolini 1935–36; Steffen 1939, 21–23; Liapis–Stephanopoulos 2019, 62f.

*Until the end of the nineteenth century biographical information for Sosiphanes depended on an entry in the Suda (**T 1**) which is clearly confused: a dramatist active at Athens in the 330s or 320s cannot have been one of the Pleiad in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus (283–246: below, pp. 270–75) nor have flourished and died at the same time. Attempts to explain these confusions were superseded by the discovery in 1897 of an additional piece of the Parian Marble inscription (»» Vol. 1, p. 13) which was promptly published (Krispi–Wilhelm 1897). This piece covers the period 336/5–299/8, not long before the whole stone was inscribed in 264/3. It records the death of a poet Sosiphanes aged 45 in 313/2 BC*

T 1 Suda *σ* 863

Σωσιφάνης, Σωσικλέους, Συρακούσιος, τραγικός. ἐδίδαξε δράματα ογ΄, ἐνίκησε δὲ ζ΄. {ἔστι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκ τῶν ζ΄ τραγικῶν, οἵτινες ὠνομάσθησαν Πλειάς.} ἐγένετο δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν τελευταίων χρόνων Φιλίππου, οἱ δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνος. τελευτᾷ δὲ ρια΄ ὀλυμπιάδι, οἱ δὲ ριδ΄· οἱ δὲ ἀκμάσαι αὐτὸν γράφουσι.

ἔστι δὲ . . . Πλειάς del. Jacoby (see Sosiphanes II **T 2**)

T 2 *Marmor Parium* (cf. Thespis **T 2**) B 15 ed. Rotstein 2016

ἀφ᾽ οὗ Σωσιφάνης ποιητὴς τελευτᾶι, ἔτη ΔΔΔΔΓΙΙΙΙ, ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Θεοφράστου, βι[οὺ]ς ἔ̣τ̣η̣ Δ̣ΔΔΔΓ.

T 4

P. Petrie 2.49(b) (see Aristarchus **F 1a**, Vol. 1), col. 1.5–9

] Σωσιφάνους·
Σωσι]φάνους τ̣ὰ̣δ̣ . . . . δ . . ταῦτα
]τρ̣ηναμ̣ενεγλα̣ . [ ] . .
]ορ̣ . ονεχε . . . δ̣ῶ̣ . τε μ̣έλ̣{λ̣}ισσα
]τ . . ρ̣ζ̣μ̣η̣νοσ̣ . . . ι̣σατο

9 σμῆνος Maltomini (2001)

(Sosiphanes 1 ***T 2****) and almost certainly the birth of a poet Sosiphanes in 306/5 (Sosiphanes II T 1: below, p. 274). Wilhelm recognized that these were two poets but assumed that the Suda's Sosiphanes of Syracuse was the younger one. Jacoby (1903) more plausibly inferred that the Suda's first and third sentences refer to the older Sosiphanes and the second sentence making him one of the Pleiad refers to the younger one and was mistakenly inserted in this entry (he also suggested that the younger poet was the older one's grandson). Jacoby's diagnosis is now generally accepted. The Suda's further statement that Sosiphanes died in the 111th or 114th Olympiad can also be disregarded: see below on* ***T 1****.*

*If Sosiphanes I died aged 45 in 313/12 (****T 2****), he was born between mid-358 and mid-356. The Suda's record of seventy-three plays and seven victories probably reflects the didascalic records for the Athenian festivals. The number of plays is large for a career of 25 years or less, but other fourth-century tragedians are credited with even greater productivity (Astydamas II, Carcinus II). This record and the fact that he competed regularly at Athens suggest that the few fragments, all ascribed simply to Sosiphanes, are probably his rather than the younger poet's (cf.* MusTr *295 n. 1). They amount to a single play-title (*Meleager*), three text-fragments (****F 1–3****) and two mythographic references (****F 4****, ****F 7****; for* ***[F 5]*** *and* ***[F 6]*** *see the notes below).*

T 1 Suda

Sosiphanes, son of Sosicles, Syracusan, tragedian. He produced 73 plays, and won 7 times. {And he too is one of the 7 tragedians who were called the Pleiad.} He lived in the last years of Philip, others say of Alexander of Macedon. He died in the 111th Olympiad (336/5–333/2 BC), others say the 114th (324/3–321/0 BC); others write that he was in his prime (i.e. at those times).

T 2 Parian Marble

Since the poet Sosiphanes died, 49 years, Theophrastus being archon at Athens (313/2 BC), aged 45 years.

T 4 Petrie papyrus (epigrams on tragic poets and plays)

(On the . . . . .) of Sosiphanes:

. . . these . . . of Sosiphanes . . . *(two verses mostly lost)* . . . bee . . .
. . . *swarm?* . . .

ΜΕΛΕΑΓΡΟΣ

For Meleager as a tragic subject see above on Antiphon's Meleager *(pp. 16–19). The context of* ***F 1*** *is unknown. Drawing down the Moon is often a feature of erotic magic in Hellenistic and later poetry and could be relevant to Meleager's love for Atalanta (Kotlińska–Toma 59f.).*

F 1 Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.533

τὸ παλαιὸν ᾄοντο τὰς φαρμακίδας τὴν σελήνην καὶ τὸν ἥλιον καθαιρεῖν. διὸ καὶ μέχρι τῶν Δημοκρίτου χρόνων πολλοὶ τὰς ἐκλείψεις καθαιρέσεις ἐκάλουν. Σωσιφάνης ἐν Μελεάγρῳ·

μάγοις ἐπῳδαῖς πᾶσα Θεσσαλὶς κόρη
ψευδὴς σελήνης αἰθέρος καταιβάτις

Incertae Fabulae

F 2 Stobaeus 3.20.18 (ms. S only)

Σωσιφάνους·

νῦν σοι πρὸς ὄψιν θυμὸς ἠβάτω, γέρον·
†νυνὶ δεῖ γ'† ὀργὴν ἡνίκ' ἠδικοῦ λαβεῖν.

2 νῦν δεῖ γὰρ Grotius ἠδικοῦ Mekler ουδείκου altered to οηδείκου Stob. (ἐν δείκου Trincavelli)

F 3 Stobaeus 3.22.3

Σωσιφάνους·

ὦ δυστυχεῖς μὲν πολλά, παῦρα δ' ὄλβιοι
βροτοί, τί σεμνύνεσθε ταῖς ἐξουσίαις,
ἃς ἕν τ' ἔδωκε φέγγος ἕν τ' ἀφείλετο,
ἢν δ' εὐτυχῆτε μηδὲν ὄντες εὐθέως
ἴσ' οὐρανῷ φρονεῖτε, τὸν δὲ κύριον 5
Ἅιδην παρεστῶτ' οὐχ ὁρᾶτε πλησίον;

F 4 Schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 1010

Σωσιφάνης ὁ τραγικὸς ὑπὸ τοῦ Λαΐου φησὶ τεθνηκέναι τὸν Μενοικέα, Νικόστρατος δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς Σφιγγός.

MELEAGER

F 1 Scholia on Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica*

In olden times they thought that witches drew down the Moon and the Sun. So even up to the times of Democritus (i.e. late 5th C. BC) many people called eclipses 'downdrawings'. Sosiphanes in *Meleager*:

> every Thessalian girl, with magic incantations a false downdrawer of Moon from aether . . .

Unidentified Plays

F 2 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On anger'

Sosiphanes:

> Now let your spirit wax young for all to see, old man; †*now you should*† get angry, when you were being wronged.

F 3 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On arrogance'

Σωσιφάνους·

> O mortals, luckless in many things, prosperous in few, why do you pride yourselves on those powers of yours which one day gives and one day takes away, and, if you prosper when you were nothing, straightway think sky-high thoughts and do not see the ruler Hades standing close beside you?

F 4 Scholia on Euripides' *Phoenician Women*

The tragedian Sosiphanes says that Menoeceus was killed by Laius, Nicostratus (says) by the Sphinx.

[F 5] Schol. Theocr. 18.51

Μενελάου δὲ καὶ Ἑλένης ἀναγράφονται παῖδες †Σωσιφάνης† Νικόστρατος καὶ †Ἰόλμος†, οἱ δὲ Θρόνιον, καὶ θυγατέρες Μελίτη καὶ Ἑρμιόνη.

1 Σωσιφάνει Dübner 2 ⟨Αἰθ⟩ιόλας Valckenaer Ἰόλαος Wendel θυγατέρες Μελίτη etc. Triclinius, Callierges θυγατέρας Μελίτην etc. schol.

[F 6] Schol.^{A} *Iliad* 9.453 (~ Eustathius *ad loc.* citing Apion)

τῇ πιθόμην ⟨καὶ ἔρεξα⟩: Ἀριστόδημος ὁ Νυσαιεύς, ῥήτωρ τε ἅμα καὶ γραμματικός, φεύγων τὸ ἔγκλημα, ἐπενόησε γράφειν *τῇ οὐ πιθόμην †οὐδὲ ἔρεξα†*. καὶ οὐ μόνον γε ηὐδοκίμησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐτιμήθη ὡς εὐσεβῆ τηρήσας τὸν ἥρωα. πρὸ δὲ αὐτοῦ Σωσιφάνης τὴν τοιαύτην εὗρε γραφήν. καὶ Εὐριπίδης δὲ ἀναμάρτητον εἰσάγει τὸν ἥρωα ἐν τῷ Φοίνικι. ταῦτα ἱστορεῖ Ἀρποκρατίων ὁ Δίου διδάσκαλος ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῆς Ι.

2 οὐδ᾽ ἔρξα Cobet

F 7 Schol. Eur. *Andr.* 32

Φιλοκλῆς δὲ ὁ τραγῳδοποιὸς καὶ Θέογνις προεκδοθῆναί φασιν ὑπὸ Τυνδάρεω τὴν Ἑρμιόνην τῷ Ὀρέστῃ καὶ ἤδη ἐγκυμονοῦσαν ὑπὸ Μενελάου δοθῆναι Νεοπτολέμῳ καὶ γεννῆσαι Ἀμφικτυόνα· ὕστερον δὲ Διομήδει συνοικῆσαι. Σωσιφάνης δὲ καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης φασὶν ἐξ αὐτῆς Νεοπτολέμῳ Ἀγχίαλον γενέσθαι, Δεξιὸς δὲ Φθῖον, Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ Πηλέα.

[F 5] Scholia on Theocritus

Menelaus and Helen are recorded as having sons †Sosiphanes† Nicostratus and †Iolmos† (some say Thronios), and daughters Melite and Hermione.

[F 6] Scholia on *Iliad* 9

I obeyed her and did it: Aristodemus of Nyssa, rhetor and also grammarian, wanted to avoid the complaint (i.e. that Phoenix seduced his father's concubine) and had the idea of writing *I disobeyed her †and did not do it†*. He not only got credit for this but was even honoured for having protected the hero's piety. Before him Sosiphanes had come up with this kind of text. And Euripides too introduces the hero without fault in his *Phoenix*. This is explained by Harpocration, teacher of Dios, in his commentary on Book 9.

F 7 Scholia on Euripides' *Andromache*

Philocles the tragedian and Theognis say that Hermione was first given by Tyndareus to Orestes and when she was already pregnant was given by Menelaus to Neoptolemus and gave birth to Amphictyon; and that she later lived with Diomedes. Sosiphanes and Asclepiades say she bore to Neoptolemus a son Anchialos; Dexios (calls him) Phthios, and Alexander Peleus.

Notes on Sosiphanes I

T 1, T 2

See above, pp. 232f. on the interpretation of these testimonia.

T 1

{And he too is one of the 7 etc.}: Jacoby's diagnosis of the two Parian Marble records was accepted by Schramm 8–10, Diehl in *RE* 3A, 1167f. (1929), Steffen 21, Snell in *TrGF*, *MusTr* 295 nn. 1–2 (cf. Liapis–Stephanopoulos 62f.). Munro (1901, 361) followed by Beloch (1927, 565f.) suggested that the Parian Marble's younger Sosiphanes was an error for Sositheus; against this see Jacoby 1903, 460 and in *FGrH*, Diehl, Schramm. Snell suggested avoiding the deletion by reading ἄλλος for αὐτός ('There is also another (Sosiphanes) . . . '), but in such cases the Suda has ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἕτερος (α 734, 2684 and with name added α 1128, 1284, 1289, 2734), which would have been less easily corrupted.

He lived in the last years (lit. 'times') **of Philip: ἐγένετο** in such contexts usually means 'was born' but here must be equivalent to **lived** or a vague

floruit.[1] Philip was assassinated in autumn 336 when Sosiphanes was aged about 22, so the connection with the last years of Alexander, who died in 323, is more likely. The statements that **he lived etc.** and **he died etc.** contradict each other; in fact it was Philip who died in the 111th Olympiad (336/5–333/2), Alexander in the 114th (324/3–321/0) and Sosiphanes near the end of the 116th (**T 2**). The Suda's confusions may have originated in a misreading of PIΔ (114th) as PIA (111th: Steffen 23); the explanation that these were the last years of Philip and Alexander was then mistakenly applied to Sosiphanes and later corrected (**others write etc.**).

T 4

From the papyrus fragment containing literary epigrams on famous tragedians including Aristarchus (**F 1a** n., Vol. 1) and Astydamas (**T 9** n.). **bee . . . *swarm*:** the poet is a honey-gathering bee, cf. Phrynichus **T 10(c)**, **10(d)**, **10(g)** n., LSJ 'μέλισσα' II.1.

F 1

Witches were often associated with Thessaly and often credited with using spells to draw the Moon down from the sky or influence other heavenly bodies, e.g. Ap. Rhod. 3.528–33 (where the scholia quote Sosiphanes) and 4.59–61, Ar. *Clouds* 749–52 with Schol., Pl. *Gorgias* 513a5f., Hor. *Epodes* 5.45f., 17.78. For charges of trickery see e.g. Hippocrates, *On the Sacred Disease* 1.62–79, Propertius 1.1.19, Plut. *Mor.* 416f–417a. One such trick is described by the early Christian writer Hippolytus, *Refutation of All Heresies* 4.37. »» Hill 1973, Fedeli on Propertius 1.1.19, Watson on Hor. *Epode* 5.45f.

[Hill shows that **many people called eclipses 'down-drawings'** means only that at one time eclipses were often attributed to witchcraft, not that 'down-drawing' was another word for 'eclipse' or only referred to eclipses. **καταιβάτις** usually means 'descending' (< καταβαίνω, especially of paths to the underworld), here uniquely 'causing to descend' (< καταβιβάζω, cf. e.g. Schol. Ar. *Clouds* 746 εἰ . . . καθέλοιμι καὶ καταβιβάσαιμι . . . τὴν σελήνην).**]**

F 2

An old man is encouraged to vent his anger; cf. Menander, *Samia* 497–9 where Niceratus urges Demeas to punish his son for supposedly seducing his concubine, as Amyntor punished Phoenix (see below on **[F 6]**): Ἀμύντορος | νῦν ἐχρῆν ὀργὴν λαβεῖν σε, Δημέα, καὶ τουτονὶ | ἐκτυφλῶσαι, 'Now, Demeas, you should

[1] Rohde 1878 showed that in the Suda the perfect γέγονε usually means 'lived' *vel sim.* and occasionally 'was born', while in the few comparable cases (Rohde 219 n.1) ἐγένετο means 'was born' once, 'lived' *vel. sim.* once or twice, and is unclear once.

take on Amyntor's anger and blind this fellow'. Menander could have been echoing Sosiphanes, but that is of no help in identifying Sosiphanes' context.

[νυνὶ δεῖ γ' is unmetrical, and the form νυνί was never used in serious poetry. ***†now you should†*** **get angry** is not compatible with **when you were being wronged** (assuming Mekler's **ἠδικοῦ** is correct); we expect e.g. 'now you should show the anger that was due when you were being wronged'.**]**

F 3

A striking elaboration of familiar themes, rhetorically phrased like Patrocles **F 1**. Mortals blindly arrogant in good fortune: Chaeremon **F 30** (also from this chapter of Stobaeus). Wealth etc. open to ruin in **one day**: Carcinus **F 5a** with note. Death inevitable and always at hand: Patrocles **F 1**.6f., Dionysius **F 3**. **think sky-high thoughts:** as if they are Olympian gods.

F 4

In Euripides' *Phoenissae* Creon's son Menoeceus kills himself as as a sacrifice to appease the serpent once killed by Cadmus and save Thebes from the assault of the Seven. Menoeceus is also the name of Creon's and Jocasta's father, and the son was probably invented by Euripides for this patriotic episode (»» Mastronarde 1994, 28f.). Carl Robert declared that the killing of the younger Menoeceus by Laius would have been 'a chronological enormity' and that Sosiphanes must have referred to the father; the killing of his wife's father would then have contributed to the misfortunes of Laius's descendants (Robert 1915, I.494, favoured by Schramm 11, Kotlińska-Toma 61, cf. Liapis–Stephanopoulos 63). This is unjustified. The scholiast plainly meant the younger Menoeceus, and one can easily imagine a middle-aged Laius killing Jocasta's teenaged nephew (accusing him, for example, of plotting against him as Oedipus accuses Creon in Sophocles' play). It is not clear whether the killing was part of the play's action, so its subject cannot be identified (Robert naturally favoured an *Oedipus*, following Welcker 1841, 1267).

[The Euripidean scholiast seems to be comparing tragic sources, so **Nicostratus** may have been a tragedian like Sosiphanes. Snell lists him as a 'very doubtful' case (*TrGF* no. 252). The Nicostratus named as *didaskalos* in *IG* II^2 3094 = II^3 4, 497 (early 4th C.) could have been a tragic poet (»» *SEHT* II.163f.) and the one referred to here. Otherwise this Nicostratus might have been the sophist and mythographer Nicostratus (2nd C. AD: Suda ν 404, *RE* 17, 551–53, 'Nikostratos 27', *New Pauly* 'Nicostratus 10'). There is no need to turn him into a Nicomachus as C. Müller (cited by Snell on *TrGF* no. 252) suggested.**]**

[F 5]

The text is corrupt and perhaps incomplete. This Nicostratus is mentioned as a son of Menelaus and Helen as early as [Hesiod] fr. 175 M.-W., Cinaethon fr. 3 *GEF*. The D scholia on *Iliad* 3.175 and others add Aithiolas according to a

Spartan tradition (»» Gantz 1993, 322, 573); hence Valckenaer's ⟨Αἰθ⟩ιόλας here. A son Sosiphanes is not otherwise known, hence Dübner's Σωσιφάνει, 'are recorded by Sosiphanes'. Even if that is correct, this Sosiphanes was not necessarily one of the two tragic poets (see next note).

[F 6]

A comment on Phoenix's account in *Iliad* 9 of how he came to be Achilles' tutor: his mother persuaded him to lure away his father Amyntor's concubine by seducing her himself, and his father cursed and banished him when he learned of this. In Euripides' *Phoenix* the hero refused his mother's request but was falsely accused of rape by the concubine, presumably after rejecting her advances, and was then blinded and banished by his father, only to have his sight restored later by the centaur Cheiron. Euripides thus saved Phoenix's reputation. Sosiphanes and Aristodemus of Nyssa apparently went a step further by altering the Homeric text itself. This may have been a rhetorical ploy rather than a serious piece of textual criticism. Aristodemus was Posidonius's son-in-law and a distinguished teacher (Strabo 14.1.48, *RE* II.925, 'Aristodemos' 30, *LGGA* 'Aristodemus [4])'. Neither Harpocration nor Dios can be safely identified with other grammarians of this name (»» *LGGA* 'Harpocration [4]', 'Dius'). **γραφήν** clearly means a reading in the Homeric text (LSJ 'γραφή' II.d.2), and **Sosiphanes** is clearly cited as a grammarian, not a tragedian. He could be the Sosiphanes cited by a scholiast on Alcman's *Partheneion.*[2] He could also be one of the two tragedians writing as a grammarian (more likely Sosiphanes II), but even then, unless the scholion is very inaccurate, the citation is not evidence for the content of a tragedy.

F 7

For the topic and references to Philocles and Theognis see on Philocles I **F 2** (Vol. 1). The name **Anchialos** comes from epic (*Iliad* 5.609, *Od.* 1.180, 418, 8.412) but is given to a son of Hermione and Neoptolemus only here. It means 'by the sea' or 'sea-girt' and may have had some territorial implication (the alternatives Phthios and Peleus are clearly dynastic). **Asclepiades** is probably Isocrates' pupil Asclepiades of Tragilos (Theodectas **T 7**; **F 7** is *FGrH* 12 F 23). The Euripidean commentator probably cites **Sosiphanes** as yet another tragic source along with Philocles, Theognis, Asclepiades and perhaps Alexander Aetolus for the name Peleus; Dexios is not otherwise known.

---

[2] Cited for the word φάρος meaning 'plough' in Alcman 1.61: see *PMGF* I, p. 31 with Page 1951b, 14, 78f., Pfeiffer on Callimachus fr. 287 (*Hecale* fr. 111 Hollis). There is no need to change the name there to Sosigenes, an editor of Homer mentioned elsewhere in the *Iliad* scholia. It could however be an error for Sosibius, 'the most celebrated authority on Alcman and on Laconian customs': Page 1951b, 10: cf. Tsantsanoglou 2006, 14).

MOSCHION
(*TrGF* 97)

Texts. TrGF 1^2.263–68 with *addenda* 1^2.355, 5.1113f., 1116; *MusTr* 200–7, 295f.

Discussions. Wagner 1846; Meineke 1855; Ravenna 1903, 736–70; Schramm 1929, 63–83; Stephanopoulos 1988, 19–38, 1995–96 (**F 1, 3, 4**), 1999–2000 (**F 5, 7, 8**); Vinagre 2003; Mueller-Goldingen 2005, 75–88; Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 126–43; Hornblower 2019, 102f. See also below on *Pheraeans* and **F 6.**

*Moschion is known almost entirely from Stobaeus's anthology (**F 1–9**), with a single verse from an earlier anthology (**F 12**, papyrus) and probably a couplet quoted by Clement of Alexandria (**F 10?**). The only other evidence comes from two art-works, one of which (**T 2**) is a much reconstructed statuette in the Naples Archaeological Museum showing a seated figure which once held a papyrus scroll and has the name* ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝ *inscribed on its base; this was made in the first century AD but is thought to have been modelled on a statue of the poet from around 300.*[1] *The other piece (**T 1**) is one of a pair of silver cups from the early first century AD which are part of the Boscoreale Treasure, a collection of luxury silverware from one of the villas buried by the eruption of Vesuvius in AD 79, rediscovered in 1895 and now nearly all in the Musée du Louvre.*[2] *Each cup is decorated with skeletal figures in four miniature scenes and inscribed with Epicurean maxims proclaiming the brevity of human life and the importance of enjoying it while you can. Three of the scenes on each cup show emblematic poets and philosophers of the past: on one cup Sophocles, Moschion, and the Stoic Zeno debating with Epicurus; on the other Menander with Archilochus, Euripides, and the Cynic Monimus confronting the Peripatetic Demetrius of*

[1] Naples inv. 6238; Richter 1965, II. 242f. with figs. 1666–67; photo also in Kotlińska-Toma 129 (with inaccurate description). The head and some other parts of the statuette are not original.

[2] Descriptions with photos in Héron de Villefosse 1899, 58–68 and Pl. VIII; Schefold 1997, 166f. Photos also in Richter 1965, I.132(e) with fig. 1700 (Sophocles), II, 243 with fig. 1697 (Moschion); Kotlińska-Toma 128 (Moschion).

Phaleron; all except Archilochus are identified as Athenian.[3] *Moschion's skeleton has a female tragic mask in his right hand, a torch in his left and at his feet the mask of an old satyr wearing an ivy (Dionysiac) crown while another skeleton plays the lyre and a smaller one dances to the music; the inscriptions are* ΖΩΗ *'Life',* ΣΚΗΝΗ Ο ΒΙΟΣ *'Life is a stage' and* ΤΕΡΠΕ ΖΩΝ ΣΕΑ⟨Υ⟩ΤΟΝ *'Enjoy yourself while you live'.*[4]

The artefacts suggest that Moschion was a celebrated tragedian three or four hundred years after his own time, but the fragments tell us almost nothing about his qualities as a dramatist. Of the three titles, Themistocles *and probably* Pheraeans *were about historical rather than mythical events but are not necessarily typical of his work as a whole (cf. the better known output of Lycophron, pp. 288–90 below). The fragments are striking reformulations of conventional rhetorical topics, impressively elaborated in the philosophical argument of* ***F 6*** *and the pathetic narrative of* ***F 9****; hence their preservation in anthologies, but the selection is obviously one-sided. The excerpts show an accomplished poetic style, with frequent reminiscences of Homer and the classic tragedians, especially Euripides, but also a high level of variation and innovation.*[5] *There is some philosophical or otherwise prosaic language,*[6] *and some not otherwise attested before the third century.*[7] *The verses are carefully composed and elevated in tone, with many poetic epithets and frequent*

---

[3] Archilochus is ΜΥΡΙΝΑΙΟC, i.e. from Myrrhina on Paros. Sophocles, Moschion, Zeno, Epicurus, Menander, Euripides and Monimus are all ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟC (Zeno came from Cyprus and Monimus from Syracuse, so Moschion was not necesarily Athenian-born). Demetrius's name is effaced but he is identifed by the snake which he holds (Α⟨C⟩ΠΙ⟨C⟩), i.e. the asp which was used to kill him in Egypt.

[4] Gigante 1979, 114–22 surveys the history of the idea of life as a theatrical performance in ancient literature; see also Easterling 2002. Gigante notes the Epicurean tone of some of the fragments of Moschion, especially **F 6** and **F 7** (cf. Schramm 78 on **F 7**).

[5] *Hapax legomena* **F 6**.7 στεγήρης, 11 εὐιῶτις, 13 σαρκοβρώς, 26 ζυγουλκός, **9**.3 προσίκτης; other rare words **F 6**.5 ὀρειγενής, δυσήλιος, 27 περισκεπής, 31 ἐπιμοιρᾶσθαι, **9**.3 ἀγκαλίζεσθαι; *variatio* e.g. **F 2**.4, **6**.3, **6**.9f., **7**.2. See the notes below and the detailed studies of Stephanopoulos (bibliography for Moschion above and 2014, 196).

[6] **F 6**.6 ἐνναίω + acc., 10 καρπὸς ὄμπνιος, 26 ἀροτρεύω, **8**.1 τρανός, **9.**2 λιτός, 9 κανθός.

[7] **F 6**.6 ἐνναίω + acc., 10 καρπὸς ὄμπνιος, 26 ἀροτρεύω, **8**.1 τρανός, **9.**2 λιτός, 9 κανθός.

hyperbata and interlaced phrasing.[8] *Nearly half of them consist of just four or five words.*

With no biographical information it is difficult to date Moschion precisely. The name was common, and there is no good reason to identify him with any of the Moschions named as parasites etc. by comic poets of the fourth or early third centuries.[9] *If his* Pheraeans *was about the death of Alexander of Pherae, he must have been active substantially later than 358, or after say 330 if the play was inspired by Theopompus's narrative (see below, pp. 247f.). A statue of a mature Moschion made around 300 would also suggest a career in the late fourth century, perhaps extending to the early third, and it can be noted that all the other figures on the Boscoreale cups except for the classics Archilochus, Sophocles and Euripides were active in that period. Since Schramm's study Moschion has usually been classified as Hellenistic and assigned to the third century on stylistic grounds (the strict metre of the fragments with no resolutions, midline caesuras, or violations of Porson's bridge, refined poetic language),*[10] *but the case has rested mainly on comparisons with Lycophron's* Alexandra *which is eccentric and may be the work of a different and later poet (below, p. 288).*[11] *Without it the comparanda consist of ten tragic verses of Sosiphanes, four of Lycophron of Chalcis and two of Sositheus, with twenty-four satyric verses of Sositheus and fourteen from Lycophron's* Menedemus *which differ radically from the*

---

[8] **F 1**.2, **4**.2–4, **5**.2f., **6**.2, 7f., 10, 11f., 14f., 19, 22, 29, 33, **7**.3f., 5, **9**.10f.

[9] Axionicus fr. 4.14 *PCG*, Alexis fr. 238 *PCG* (see Arnott's note), Strato fr. 1.13 *PCG*, Machon 6.46ff. (see Gow's note). Wagner 1–5 and other 19th C. scholars placed Moschion in the fourth century because of these. Wilamowitz noted their irrelevance (1924, II.149 n. 1).

[10] Schramm 66f., 81–83, cf. Walker 1923, 219 ('Alexandrian'), Stephanopoulos 1988, 35–38 ('Hellenistic', n. 62)', *New Pauly* 'Moschion [1]' (B. Zimmermann, 'probably 2nd half of 3rd cent. BC'), Vinagre 116f., 124–26 suggesting a date 'well into the 3rd C. at the earliest' (143) on the uncompelling grounds that Menander would not have named some of his young characters Moschion if the tragedian was well known at the time and that the anthropology of **F 6** is similar to Diodorus's.

[11] The absence of resolutions in the fragments does not mean that Moschion always avoided such things (still less the absence of midline caesuras and violations of Porson's Law). He may have used resolution sparingly as in the *Oresteia*, most of the extant plays of Sophocles and the earliest ones of Euripides.

rest.[12] *This is obviously far too little to permit any generalizations about tragic style after about 330. For Moschion a dating 'around 300' is perhaps the best we can do.*[13]

ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ

The subject was probably the destruction of the Persian fleet at the Battle of Salamis in 480 BC which was masterminded by Themistocles and dramatized in Phrynichus's Phoenician Women *(476 BC: Vol. 1, 38–41, 47f.) and the extant* Persians *of Aeschylus (472 BC). This was proposed by Meineke (1839, 522) and is now widely accepted.*[14] *If it is correct,* ***F 1*** *may be Themistocles arguing that the Greek fleet can defeat*

F 1 Stobaeus 4.10.17

Μοσχίωνος ἐκ Θεμιστοκλέους·

καὶ γὰρ ἐν νάπαις βραχεῖ
πολὺς σιδήρῳ κείρεται πεύκης κλάδος,
καὶ βαιὸς ὄχλος μυρίας λόγχης κρατεῖ.

[12] Lycophron **F 2–4** have seven resolutions in fourteen lines, one mid-line caesura and one violation of Porson's bridge

[13] '[H]e may have straddled the two [i.e. 4th and 3rd centuries]', Hornblower 2019, 102.

[14] Ribbeck (1875, 147–55, cf. Ravenna 750–55) objected that apter tragic topics could be found in Themistocles' later career (see especially Thucydides 1.135–38); Moschion's play might then have been about his death by suicide in Ionia and covert burial in Attica (with **F 4** and **F 9** included as well as **F 1**), and the *Themistocles* of Philiscus or Philicus (cf. pp. 230, 301) might have been about his acceptance as a suppliant by the Molossian king Admetus. It seems a little unlikely that the hero of Salamis would have been commemorated in such ways in an Athenian production, and Ribbeck's interpretations of the relevant fragments are unconvincing. Hornblower (2019, 102f.) leans towards Themistocles' death and burial as a subject.

THEMISTOCLES

the Persians if they join battle in the straits of Salamis (cf. Herodotus 8.60β). There is no other evidence for Moschion's dramatization of these events, but the title suggests that he made Themistocles the central character in contrast with Aeschylus's play, which treated the victory as a collective achievement and did not name the commander at all.

F 1 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'Praise of boldness'

Moschion, from *Themistocles*:

> On woodland slopes too an abundance of pine-branches is cut by a little axe, and a small host overcomes ten thousand spearmen.

ΤΗΛΕΦΟΣ

A play called Telephus *was probably about the hero's healing by Achilles, like the tragedies with this title by Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides (cf. on Agathon's* Telephus *in Vol. 1, pp. 158–60).* ***F 2*** *might be Telephus complaining about his plight as often suggested, but this is*

F 2 Stobaeus 1.4.1
Μοσχίωνος Τηλέφου·

ὦ καὶ θεῶν κρατοῦσα καὶ θνητῶν μόνη
Μοῖρ', ὦ λιταῖς ἄτρωτε δυστήνων βροτῶν,
πάντολμ' Ἀνάγκη, στυγνὸν ἣ κατ' αὐχένων
ἡμῶν ἐρείδεις τῆσδε λατρείας ζυγόν.

2 Μοῖρ', ὦ Grotius μοῖρα Stob. 3 πάντολμ' Ἀνάγκη Tyrwhitt, Porson πᾶν τολῆμ' ἀνάγκης Stob. 4 τῆσδε Ruhnken τῆς τε Stob.

ΦΕΡΑΙΟΙ

Meineke 1855; Ribbeck 1875, 155–59; Ravenna 1903, 758–67; Xanthaki-Karamanou 1986; Stephanopoulos 1995–96, 144–49.

The play is known only from ***F 3****, which indicates a dispute over the abuse of a man's corpse and gives the title as either* Pheraioi *(*Men of Pherae*) or* Pheraiai *(*Women of Pherae*).*[15] *Earlier attempts at identifying the subject assumed* Women*,*[16] *but since Meineke* Men *has generally been preferred. Either way, the title suggests that the play had a chorus. In the absence of an obvious mythical context Meineke suggested that the play, like* Themistocles*, was based on a historical event, in this case*

[15] The manuscripts of Stobaeus that give the lemma in full have Μοσχίωνος ἐκ Φεραιῶν, but both masculine and feminine forms are properly Φεραίων (see e.g. Smyth 1920, §287, Probert 2003, §115 on the accentuation of 1st-declension feminine plural adjectives). The false accentuation encouraged earlier interpretations of the title as *Women of Pherae* (next note).

[16] Welcker (1841, 1049) supposed an adaptation of Euripides' *Alcestis* with a female chorus, Kayser (1845, 298f.) an adaptation of Euripides' *Suppliant Women* with allusion to the devastation of Pheraean territory by Pharnabazus and Conon in 394. Wagner (1846, 14–16) pointed out the implausibilities of both but offered no alternative.

TELEPHUS

not supported by Eur. Telephus *F 716.1 (where ἀνάγκη is simply what the gods want)*[17] *and lines 3–4 seem to imply a situation different from that of Euripides' hero (see* ***F 2*** *n.).*

F 2 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On divine necessity etc.'

From Moschion's *Telephus*:

> O you who alone have power over gods and mortals, Fate, invulnerable to pleas of wretched men, ruthless Necessity, who press on our necks this hateful yoke of servitude!

PHERAEANS

the murder of Polyphron, brother and successor of the tyrant Jason of Pherae, by his nephew Alexander in 369 BC. Accounts of this make no mention of the issue of burial.[18] *Ribbeck identified a more likely historical subject, the murder of Alexander himself by his wife (a daughter of Jason and niece of Polyphron) and her half-brothers in 358. This event is described in melodramatic terms by Xenophon and Plutarch and in one of Conon's* Narratives.[19] *Plutarch adds that Alexander's corpse suffered abuse (αἰκία), 'being cast out and trampled on by the Pheraeans', and the fourth-century historian Theopompus is cited as saying that his body was thrown into the sea and his bones collected by fishermen and returned to his kinsmen for burial on instructions from the god Dionysus, whose cult Alexander had favoured.*[20] *Theopompus*

---

[17] σὺ δ' εἶκ' ἀνάγκῃ καὶ θεοῖσι μὴ μάχου, 'But you, yield to compulsion and do not fight against the gods' (probably Telephus persuading Achilles to heal him).

[18] Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.34; cf. Diod. Sic. 15.61.2, Plut. *Pelopidas* 29.8.

[19] Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.33, Plut. *Pelopidas* 35, Conon *FGrH* 26 F 1.50; briefly Diod. Sic.16.14.1.

[20] Theopompus *FGrH* 115 F 352 = Schol.^{T} *Iliad* 24.428b Erbse.

probably related the whole episode in detail, and his account will have been known to Moschion. That the play was about the murder of Alexander and a dispute over his burial is therefore quite plausible and is widely favoured,[21] *but it remains a conjecture and the details of Moschion's plot and the precise context of* ***F 3*** *are in any case uncertain.*

It has been suggested that ***F 6*** *and* ***F 7*** *come from this play,*[22] *but* ***F 6*** *says nothing about mutilating corpses and is more likely from a play*

F 3 Stobaeus 4.57.3

Μοσχίωνος ἐκ Φεραίων·

κενὸν θανόντος ἀνδρὸς αἰκίζειν σκιάν·
ζῶντας κολάζειν, οὐ θανόντας εὐσεβές.

INCERTAE FABULAE

F 4 Stobaeus 3.13.30

Μοσχίωνος·

ὅμως τό γ' ὀρθὸν καὶ δίκαιον οὔποτε
σιγῇ παρήσω· τὴν γὰρ ἐντεθραμμένην
ἀστοῖς Ἀθάνας τῇ τε Θησέως πόλει
καλὸν φυλάξαι γνησίως παρρησίαν.

F 5 Stobaeus 4.5.10

Μοσχίωνος·

μόνον σὺ θυμοῦ χωρὶς ἔνδεξαι λόγους
οὕς σοι κομίζω· τὸν κλύοντα γὰρ λαβὼν
ὁ μῦθος εὔνουν οὐ μάτην λεχθήσεται.

---

[21] e.g. Ravenna 1903, 761; Wilamowitz 1924, II.149 n.1; Schramm 1929, 68; Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 122f.; 1990, 96f.; Stephanopoulos 1995–96, 144–46; Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 131f. Hornblower 2019, 102 suggests a third option: the murder of Jason himself in 370 (Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.31f., Diod. Sic. 15.60.5).

[22] e.g. Wagner 1846, 22; Ribbeck 1875, 158f.; Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 119, 122 and 1990; Vinagre 2003, 129; Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 136f., 143. Against attributing **F 6** to *Pheraeans* see Stephanopoulos 1995–96, 146f.

like Euripides' Suppliant Women *in which the principle of burial was at issue, and* ***F 7*** *is perhaps too like* ***F 3*** *to belong with it. Meineke (102–5) combined* ***F 4*** *with* ***F 5*** *and ascribed them to the proem of a speech including* ***F 6*** *and* ***F 7*** *and followed by a stichomythic dialogue containing (separately) the two verses of* ***F 3****. The case for* ***F 4*** *and* ***F 5*** *is weak (****F 4*** *with its Athenian speaker is particularly problematic) and is not admitted in recent discussions. See the notes on all these fragments.*

F 3 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'That one should not abuse the dead'

Moschion, from *Pheraeans*:

> It's futile to abuse the shade of a dead man. It's proper to punish the living, not the dead.

UNIDENTIFIED PLAYS

F 4 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On frankness of speech'

Moschion:

> Still, I'll never pass over in silence what is right and just. It's a fine thing to preserve with true-born integrity the virtue that is bred in Athena's citizens and the city of Theseus: frankness of speech.

F 5 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On governing'

Moschion:

> Only accept without anger the words I bring you. The message that finds its hearer well-disposed will not be spoken in vain.

F 6 Stobaeus 1.8.38

Μοσχίωνος·

πρῶτον δ' ἄνειμι καὶ διαπτύξω λόγῳ
ἀρχὴν βροτείου καὶ κατάστασιν βίου.
ἦν γάρ ποτ' αἰὼν κεῖνος, ἦν ὀπηνίκα
θηρσὶν διαίτας εἶχον ἐμφερεῖς βροτοί,
ὀρειγενῆ σπήλαια καὶ δυσηλίους
φάραγγας ἐνναίοντες, οὐδέπω γὰρ ἦν
οὔτε στεγήρης οἶκος οὔτε λαΐνοις
εὐρεῖα πύργοις ὠχυρωμένη πόλις·
οὐ μὴν ἀρότροις ἀγκύλοις ἐτέμνετο
μέλαινα καρποῦ βῶλος ὀμπνίου τροφός,
οὐδ' ἐργάτης σίδηρος εὐιώτιδος
θάλλοντας οἴνης ὀρχάτους ἐτημέλει,
ἀλλ' ἦν ἀκύμων †κωφεύουσα ῥέουσα† γῆ,
βοραὶ δὲ σαρκοβρῶτας ἀλληλοκτόνοι
παρεῖχον αὐτοῖς δαῖτας· ἦν δ' ὁ μὲν Νόμος
ταπεινός, ἡ Βία δὲ σύνθρονος Διί.
{ὁ δ' ἀσθενὴς ἦν τῶν ἀμεινόνων βορά.}
ἐπεὶ δ' ὁ τίκτων πάντα καὶ τρέφων Χρόνος
τὸν θνητὸν ἠλλοίωσεν ἔμπαλιν βίον,
εἴτ' οὖν μέριμναν τὴν Προμηθέως σπάσας
εἴτ' οὖν ἀνάγκην εἴτε τῇ μακρᾷ τριβῇ
αὐτὴν παρασχὼν τὴν φύσιν διδάσκαλον,
τόθ' ηὑρέθη μὲν καρπὸς ἡμέρου τροφῆς
Δήμητρος ἀγνῆς, ηὑρέθη δὲ Βακχίου
γλυκεῖα πηγή, γαῖα δ' ἡ πρὶν ἄσπορος
ἤδη ζυγουλκοῖς βουσὶν ἠροτρεύετο,
ἄστη δ' ἐπυργώσαντο καὶ περισκεπεῖς
ἔτευξαν οἴκους καὶ τὸν ἠγριωμένον
εἰς ἥμερον δίαιταν ἤγαγον βίον.
κἀκ τοῦδε τοὺς θανόντας ὥρισεν Νόμος
τύμβοις καλύπτειν κἀπιμοιρᾶσθαι κόνιν
νεκροῖς ἀθάπτοις, μηδ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐᾶν
τῆς πρόσθε θοίνης μνημόνευμα δυσσεβοῦς.

3 ὁπηνίκα FP ποθ' ἡνίκα Nauck 14 σαρκοβρῶτας ἀλληλοκτόνοι Wecklein -ες -ους FP 16 Διί Grotius (διὶ P^2) νηὶ FP^1 δίκῃ Canter 17 del. Nauck (susp. Wachsmuth) 27 ἄστη Wesseling αὖτη FP 32 νεκροῖς ἀθάπτοις Meineke -οὺς -ους FP 33 δυσσεβοῦς Valckenaer -ές FP

F 6 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On the nature of time etc.'
Moschion:

> First I shall go back and shall unfold in speech the original constitution of human life. There was once that age when mortals had ways of life similar to beasts, inhabiting mountain caves and sunless[5] ravines, for there was yet neither roofed dwelling nor broad city fortified with walls of stone; nor again was the black clod that rears the bountiful harvest cleft by angular ploughs,[10] nor did hard-working iron tend the Bacchant vine's burgeoning rows, but earth was barren † . . . *(text corrupt)* . . . †, and food from mutual slaughter afforded them carnivorous feasts. Law was weak,[15] and Violence shared Zeus's throne {and the weak one was the superior ones' food}. But when Time who begets and nurtures all changed human life about, either inducing Prometheus's concern,[20] or making necessity or, in its long course, nature herself a teacher, then was discovered the harvest of holy Demeter's cultivated food, discovered too the Bacchic god's sweet stream, and earth, till then unsown,[25] came to be ploughed by yoke-dragging oxen; they fortified cities for themselves, built enclosed dwellings, and brought their savage life into a gentle state. And thence did Law determine[30] that we should conceal the dead in tombs and give to unburied corpses a portion of dust, and not admit to our eyes a reminder of that former impious feast.

F 7 Stobaeus 4.57.14

Μοσχίωνος·

<τί> κέρδος οὐκέτ' ὄντας αἰκίζειν νεκρούς;
τί τὴν ἄναυδον γαῖαν ὑβρίζειν πλέον;
ἐπὰν γὰρ ἡ κρίνουσα καὶ θἠδίονα
καὶ τἀνιαρὰ φροῦδος αἴσθησις φθαρῇ,
τὸ σῶμα κωφοῦ τάξιν εἴληφεν πέτρου.

θ' ἡδίονα Stob. ms. B (Paris. 1985, 16th C.) τὰ ἡδίονα Stob. mss. SMA τὰς ἡδονὰς Porson

F 8 Stobaeus 4.49.10

Μοσχίωνος·

ἦν ἄρα τρανὸς αἶνος ἀνθρώπων ὅδε,
ὡς τὸν πέλας μὲν νουθετεῖν βραχὺς πόνος,
αὐτὸν δ' ἐνεγκεῖν ὕβριν ἠδικημένον
πάντων μέγιστον τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις βάρος.

3 αὐτὸν Stob. ms. S αύτὸν Stob. mss. MA, ed Trinc.

F 9 Stobaeus 4.41.22

Μοσχίωνος·

σὺν αἶσι δόξῃ πρόσθε καὶ γένει μέγας
Ἄργους δυνάστης, λιτὸς ἐκ τυραννικῶν
θρόνων, προσίκτην θαλλὸν ἠγκαλισμένος
ἔστειχεν εἰς γῆν ὄμμα συμπαθὲς φέρων
καὶ πᾶσι δεικνὺς ὡς τὰ λαμπρὰ τῆς τύχης
τὴν κτῆσιν οὐ βέβαιον ἀνθρώποις νέμει.
ὃν πᾶς μὲν ἀστῶν ἠλέησεν εἰσιδών,
ἅπας δὲ χεῖρα καὶ προσήγορον φάτιν
ὤρεξε κανθούς τ' ἐξέτηξε δακρύοις
τύχαις συναλγῶν· τἀξίωμα γὰρ νοσοῦν
τὸ πρόσθε πολλοῖς οἶκτον ἐμποιεῖ βροτῶν.

1 σὺν αἶσι Meineke σὺν αῖσι *or* σὺν αἶσσι *or* συνέσει Stob. mss. 11 ἐμποιεῖ Haupt εὐπορεῖ Stob.

F 7 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'That one should not abuse the dead'

Moschion:

> What profit in abusing lifeless corpses? What gain is there in insulting voiceless earth? Once sensation that discerns pleasures and pains departs and perishes, the body has attained the condition of an unfeeling rock.

F 8 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'That it is easier to advise others than oneself'

Moschion:

> So it was accurate, this saying of men, that counselling the next man is slight labour, but bearing the abuse oneself when one is wronged is the greatest burden of all that men can suffer.

F 9 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'That human prosperity is insecure etc.'

Moschion:

> . . . with whom (*or* which?) the ruler of Argos, once great in fame and family, now humble after his royal throne, embracing a suppliant branch, entered the land bearing a pitiable countenance, showing to every one that fortune's splendours[5] bestow on men no sure possession. Every citizen felt pity looking upon him, every one stretched out a hand and offered words of address and soaked their eyes with tears, sharing the pain of his misfortunes. For previous high status now afflicted[10] provokes compassion in many men.

F 10? Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 6.2.14

Βακχυλίδου τε εἰρηκότος, *παύροισι δὲ θνητῶν τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον δαίμων ἔδωκεν πράσσοντας ἐν καιρῷ πολιοκρόταφον γῆρας ἱκνεῖσθαι πρὶν ἐγκῦρσαι δύᾳ* (fr. 25 Snell–Maehler), Μοσχίων ὁ κωμικὸς γράφει·

κεῖνος δ’ ἁπάντων ἐστὶ μακαριώτατος,
ὃς διὰ τέλους ζῶν ὁμαλὸν ἤσκησεν βίον.

F 11 *An excerpt now missing from the text of Stobaeus 4.55 ‘On burial’*[23]

F 12 Florence gnomology, *PSI* XV.1476 (2nd C. AD) fr. 3, col. i.11ff., ed. Bastianini (2008) after Bartoletti 1966; photo in Bastianini (Tav. XVII) and on *PSI* website (1476 r b–e).

Μ]ο̣σ̣χίωνος·

ὦ Μοῖρα δυσπάλαιστος ἀνθρώπ[οις

[23] A lemma ‘Moschion’ is accompanied by Eur. *Supp.* 531–36. Presumably Moschion’s excerpt and the next heading ‘Euripides’ have been accidentally omitted (Meineke 113f.).

F 10? Clement of Alexandria

And whereas Bacchylides has said, *To few amongst mortals has God granted that they should live fortunately and reach grey-templed old age before encountering misery*, Moschion the comic poet writes:

> That man is the most blessed of all who practises to the end an even life.

F 11 *See opposite.*

F 12 Papyrus gnomology

Moschion:

> O Fate, hard for mankind to wrestle with . . .

Notes on Moschion

F 1

Cf. Eur. *Archelaus* F 243 ὀλίγον ἄλκιμον δόρυ | κρεῖσσον στρατηγῷ μυρίου στρατεύματος 'A small but valiant force is worth more to a general than a vast army', F 244, *Erechtheus* F 356, Sositheus **F 1** n. **1–2 On woodland slopes etc.:** cf. Eur. *Med.* 3f. ἐν νάπαισι Πηλίου . . . τμηθεῖσα πεύκη 'pine cut on Pelion's slopes (for the sense of **νάπαις** see Cropp on Eur. *El.* 445f.). **an abundance of pine-branches:** lit. 'much pine-branch', collective singular as in *Med.* 4 above, Eur. F 88 πολὺς . . . κισσός, εὐφυὴς κλάδος 'abundant ivy, a vigorous branch', i.e. an abundance of vigorously branching ivy. **3. ten thousand spearmen**: lit. 'myriad spear', the singular denoting a group of warriors by their arms (λόγχη, δόρυ, αἰχμή, ἀσπίς) as in Eur. F 243 above and often: »» KG 1.13(c)1, LSJ 'λόγχη' III. Detailed notes on this fragment in Stephanopoulos 1995–96, 140–43.

F 2

Even gods are not always free to do as they will but are constrained by a more or less impersonal force which determines individual destinies (*moirai*, 'portions') and is known as Moira ('apportionment', conventionally **Fate**; sometimes three Moirai as in Hes. *Theog.* 904–6). Cf. especially *Iliad* 16.431ff. (Zeus refrains from interfering with Sarpedon's *moira* of being killed by Patroclus); Pindar, *Paean* 6.92ff. (Zeus did not presume to prevent the destined destruction of Troy); Herodotus 1.91.1, 'It is impossible even for a god to escape the destined *moira* (τὴν πεπρωμένην μοῖραν); [Aesch.] *PV* 511ff. (the *moirai* of Prometheus

and Zeus are determined by necessity [*anankê*] which is governed by 'the three Moirai and the mindful Erinyes', cf. *PV* 103–5), *TrGF* adesp. F 503 ('Moira alone amongst gods and men is unmastered but herself wields control'). Here Moira is equated with a fully personified **Necessity** (*Anankê*) who in Eur. *Alc.* 973–82 is described and addressed in similar terms and is uninfluenced by ritual as Moira here is **invulnerable to pleas**. »» *New Pauly,* 'Moira' (A. Henrichs), 'Ananke' (P. Dräger), *OCD* 'fate' (N. Robertson, B. Dietrich).

ἄτρωτε, invulnerable: metaphorical as in Dionys. Hal. *AR* 8.39.5 οὐχ οὕτω στερρὰν καὶ ἄτρωτον ἔχει καρδίαν . . . ('His heart is not so hard and invulnerable . . . ', cf. 8.41.6), Pind. *Nem.* 11.10 ἀτρώτῳ κραδίᾳ ('with unwounded heart'), Plut. *Alcib.* 4.2. ἄτρωτον ὑπὸ φιλοσοφίας ('unwounded by philosophy'); »» Schramm 1929, 69, Stephanopoulos 1988, 20. **πάντολμ' Ἀνάγκη, ruthless Necessity:** πάντολμος is lit. 'all-daring', usually with negative implication (LSJ with Supp.). The phrase recurs in *Anth.Pal.* 9.11.5, 16.15b.5.

this hateful yoke of servitude: a frequent metaphor in tragedy, here merged with 'the yoke of Necessity' (» Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 218, Richardson on *Hom.Hymn.* 2.216) as in Soph. *Tereus* F 591.5 τοὺς δὲ δουλείας ζυγὸν ἔσχεν ἀνάγκας ('and some necessity's yoke of slavery holds'), Eur. *Andr.* 110 δουλοσύναν στυγερὰν ἀμφιβαλοῦσα κάρᾳ ('casting hateful slavery over my head') and the epitaph for those who fell at Chaeronea (Demosth. 18.289 = *Anth.Gr. Appendix* 2.52) ὡς μὴ ζυγὸν αὐχένι θέντες | δουλοσύνης στυγερὰν ἀμφὶς ἔχωσιν ὕβριν ('so that they [the Hellenes] might not put on their neck the yoke of slavery and wear its hateful hubris'). **λατρείας ζυγόν** is apparently Moschion's adaptation of the more usual δουλείας ζυγόν (Stephanopoulos 1988, 20f.). Α λάτρις is properly a hireling rather than a slave (in [Eur.] *Rhes.* 715 the disguised Odysseus in Troy is ἀγύρτης τις λάτρις, 'some beggar-hireling'). This has suggested a context for **F 2** like that of Euripides' *Telephus*, where Telephus visited the Greek camp disguised as a beggar to get his wounded leg healed and was perhaps accepted as a servant in Agamemnon's household (so e.g. Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 129), but that would hardly be a **hateful yoke of servitude** imposed by **ruthless Necessity.**

F 3

Possibly from a dispute over the burial of the body of Alexander of Pherae (above, pp. 246–48). Each verse is self-contained and the two appear to be separated by punctuation in one manuscript of Stobaeus. Some editors have treated them as separate excerpts, but they make a balanced and rhetorically effective couplet. »» Stephanopoulos 1995–96, 144–49. The speaker argues that maltreating an enemy's corpse is both futile and impious. The first point echoes Apollo's complaint about Achilles' persistent abuse of Hector's body in *Iliad* 24, where however it is not clear that such actions are regarded as impious in themselves (»» Kucewicz 2016). Both points are explicit in fifth-century tragic

episodes which Moschion will also have had in mind, especially Aeschylus's *Phrygians or Ransoming of Hector* and *Eleusinians*, Sophocles' *Ajax* and *Antigone*, Euripides' *Suppliant Women*. See also on **F 6** and **F 7**.

1. It's futile (etc.): *Iliad* 24.54 (Apollo's words), κωφὴν γὰρ δὴ γαῖαν ἀεικίζει μενεαίνων, 'He abuses unfeeling earth in his rage'. The Homeric terms ἀεικίζειν/ἀεικέα ἔργα are literally 'unseemly treatment' but imply disfiguring the corpse so that it is visibly degraded and shamed (cf. Soph *Ant.* 206 αἰκισθέν τ' ἰδεῖν with Griffith 1999, 162). **the shade** (**σκιάν**) makes an oxymoronic phrase more forceful than Homer's 'unfeeling earth' (which is echoed in **F 7**.2). All that remains of the dead man is his ghost now residing in the underworld, beyond the reach of the living (e.g. Hom. *Od.* 10.495, Soph. *Phil.* 946f., Eur. *HF* 494f.).

F 4

Someone insists on telling his audience what is right and just, even if it is for some reason unwelcome. This will have been part of an introductory statement requesting a fair hearing (*captatio benevolentiae*), like e.g. Demosthenes 9.3, Eur. F 706 and probably Eur. F 941a, F 1037. The speaker is Athenian and more likely flattering an Athenian audience than flaunting the virtue of Athenian *parrhêsia* to a non-Athenian one. Play and context are unidentifiable. The Athenian reference has suggested *Themistocles* (Wagner 16f., Ravenna 753). Meineke 103f. thought that **F 4** and **F 5** combined belonged with **F 6** and **F 7** in a single speech in *Pheraeans* (above, p. 248). »» Stephanopoulos 1995–96, 150–53.

It's a fine thing (etc.): uninhibited speech (*parrhêsia*, or *isêgoria* 'equality in speaking') was claimed by Athenians as a distinctive virtue of democratic Athens: e.g. Eur. *Hipp.* 421–23, *Supp.* 438–41, *Ion* 670–75, Dem. 9.3, »» Stephanopoulos 153. For its benefits in general see also Collard on Eur. *Supp.* 438–41. A massive hyperbaton (**τὴν γὰρ ἐντεθραμμένην . . . παρρησίαν**), a whole line devoted to Athens and its citizens as natural possessors of *parrhêsia* (3) and a four-word climax (4) all give weight to the declaration. **Theseus** was traditionally the founder and defender of Athens' civic institutions (e.g. Thuc. 2.15.2, Plut. *Thes.* 24f., Eur. *Supp.* 426–55). In line 4 **γνησίως** has a double implication, 'as a true-born Athenian' and 'with the integrity befitting my birth' (cf. Eur. *Alc.* 677f. Θεσσαλὸν . . . γνησίως ἐλεύθερον).

F 5

Another *captatio benevolentiae*, but here someone is bringing a message to a single hearer. Stephanopoulos infers a messenger preparing to deliver some bad news (a stock tragic situation, e.g. Aesch. *Pers.* 253ff., Soph. *Ant.* 223ff., 276f., Eur. *Or.* 853f., Ion **F 8a** in Vol. 1), but the tone seems apter for a go-between. »» Stephanopoulos 1999–2000, 51–53.

F 6

Schramm 1929, 71–77; Xanthakis-Karamanos 1981a (≈ 1980, 105–19); Stephanopoulos 1988, 23–29; Gallo 1998; Vinagre 2003; Mueller-Goldingen 2005, 81–84; Melero 2008; Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 132–39.

The excerpt is in Stobaeus's chapter 'On the nature and elements of time and the things for which it was responsible', but its account of how human culture developed over time is clearly the first section of a speech arguing that someone should be properly buried. The argument is carefully organized:

1–2. Introduction.

3–16. The earliest humans lived like beasts, with no housing or protected communities (5–8), no agriculture or viniculture providing regular sustenance (9–12), the land remaining unworked and unproductive (13); instead they killed each other for food, and Violence (*Bia*) rather than Law (*Nomos*) prevailed (14–16).

18–22. In time they learned better ways, either from Prometheus or from necessity (the compulsion to survive) or from nature herself (their own innate abilities and propensity to learn by experience).

23–29. Now they discovered agriculture and viniculture (23–25a), working the land by ploughing (25b–27), created settled communities with sheltered housing (27–28a), and so their formerly savage life was tamed (28b–29. Lines 23–29 reverse the topics of lines 3–16 in a kind of ring composition).

30–33. Consequently Law (no longer weak as before) determined that the dead must be properly buried and unburied corpses given a covering of dust so that no visible reminders of our cannibal past should remain.

Lines 3–29 are an eclectic sketch using ideas which were mostly familiar in Moschion's time to make a rhetorical argument focused on the issue of burial. The fundamental contrast between beasts killing and eating each other and humans recognizing justice according to Zeus's law is asserted in Hesiod's *Works and Days* (274–80) and illustrated in mythical figures such as Homer's Cyclopes. Xenophanes asserted the human capacity for self-improvement around 500 BC,[24] and theories of the development of human communities from primitive beginnings enabled by agriculture and technology were formulated by rationalist thinkers in the later fifth century such as Protagoras and Democritus, both of whom asserted the necessity of law and justice as guarantees of social

[24] Xenophanes B 18 DK: οὔτοι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς πάντα θεοὶ θνητοῖσ' ὑπέδειξαν, | ἀλλὰ χρόνωι ζητοῦντες ἐφευρίσκουσιν ἄμεινον 'Gods did not reveal everything from the beginning to mortals; with time they seek and discover better'.

harmony and communal survival.[25] Cannibalism is not a regular feature of these developmental accounts, which more often defined the earliest humans as plant-gathering vegetarians who either did not need agriculture or were saved from starvation and extinction by its discovery. The earliest mention of cannibalism as humans' original state comes probably from a fifth-century Orphic/Eleusinian poem which linked its abandonment with Demeter's introduction of agriculture and revelation of the Eleusinian Mysteries.[26] Egyptian traditions crediting similar developments to Isis and Osiris (identified by the Greeks with Demeter and Dionysus) were reported in Hecataeus of Abdera's *Egyptian History* towards the end of the fourth century.[27] Moschion's speaker, it seems, exploits this unusual information to make a novel rhetorical argument linking the burial of the dead with the renunciation of cannibalism.

The often suggested attribution of **F 6** to *Pheraeans* is unlikely (above, p. 248). Welcker (1841, 1050f.) more plausibly suggested that the subject was the burial of the Argive heroes killed in the campaign of the Seven against Thebes, as in Aeschylus's *Eleusinians* and Euripides' *Suppliant Women*.

---

[25] Democritus B 245, 248, 252 DK (D 109, 112, 116 Taylor), Protagoras in Plato, *Protagoras* 320c–323a; cf. the sophistic text known as the *Anonymus Iamblichi* (89 DK) 6.1 (see below on 21f.), Critias(?) F 19.1–8 *TrGF*. Humans' technological progress is variously described and evaluated in [Aesch.] *PV* 442–506, Soph. *Ant.* 332–75 (law 365ff.), Eur. *Suppl.* 201–13, [Hippocrates] *On Ancient Medicine* 3. Later materialist accounts: Dicaearchus frs 54–56 Mirhady, Epicurus, *Letter* 1.75.1–6 (cf. the inscription of Diogenes of Oenoanda, fr. 12 quoted below on lines 18–22), Diodorus 1.8, Lucretius 5.925–61, 1024–27 (law 958ff, 1024ff., cf. 1143ff.). »» Edelstein 1967; Cole 1967/1990; Dodds 1973, 1–25; Blundell 1986, 165–202; Konstan 2017.

[26] Orph. fr. 292 Kern = 641 Bernabé in Sext Emp. *Adv.Math.* 2.31–32 (cf. 9.15): ὁ ἠθολόγος Ὀρφεὺς τὸ ἀναγκαῖον αὐτῶν [*sc.* τῶν νόμων] ὑποφαίνων φησὶν, *ἦν χρόνος ἡνίκα φῶτες ἀπ' ἀλλήλων βίον εἶχον | σαρκοδακῆ, κρείσσων δὲ τὸν ἥττονα φῶτα δάϊζεν*. μηδενὸς γὰρ ἐπιστατοῦντος νόμου ἕκαστος ἐν χερσὶ τὸ δίκαιον εἶχε . . . μέχρις ὅτου ὁ θεὸς οἰκτείρων μογοῦσιν αὐτοῖς θεσμοφόρους θεὰς ἐξαπέστειλεν, ἃς ἐπὶ τῷ τὴν ἀλληλοφάγον ἀνομίαν καταλῦσαι πλέον ἢ ἐπὶ τῷ καρποῖς ἡμερῶσαι τὸν βίον ἐθαύμασαν ἄνθρωποι: 'The ethicist Orpheus indicating the necessity of laws (*nomoi*) says, *There was once a time when men lived off each other carnivorously, and the stronger one slew the weaker.* For with no law in charge, each one had justice in his own hands . . . until the god pitying their hardships sent them the law-bringing goddesses whom men came to revere more for putting an end to cannibalistic lawlessness than for taming their life with crops.' On the poem and its context see Graf 1973, esp. 22–39, 158–81.

[27] *FGrH* 264 F 25.96ff. in Diodorus 1.14; »» Harder 1943, 28–32; Graf 1973, 37; cf. Dieleman–Moyer 2010, 444 on the relevant Isis-aretalogies (Diodorus 1.27.3–4, *IKyme* 41 etc.).

Plutarch, who provides our essential information about Aeschylus's play (*Theseus* 29.4), says that according to Aeschylus and most later writers Theseus retrieved the bodies by persuading the Thebans to accept a truce rather than going to war as in Euripides' play. This tradition is reflected in Isocrates' *Panathenaicus* 168ff. (contradicting his own earlier account in *Panegyricus* 54ff.) and in the claim of the 4th–3rd C. Atthidographer Philochorus (cited by Plutarch) that this was the first ever truce for the retrieval of the bodies of those killed in battle.[28] The episode was one of the standard rhetorical examples of Athenian cultural hegemony, and Isocrates refers to it as one frequently treated by tragedians (*Panath.*168f.). It is hard to think of a more likely mythical context for the elaborate philosophical justification of burial seen in **F 6.**

The style of the speech is mannered and poetically elevated, especially in the descriptive passages 3–16, 23–29,[29] with frequent epithets, weighty four-word trimeters (5, 8, 11f., 14, 26f., 31), hyperbata (19, 22, 27f., 28f., 33) and elaborately interlaced phrases (2, 7f., 10, 11f., 14f.). Some adjectives are found here uniquely or nearly so (5 ὀρειγενής, δυσήλιος, 7 στεγήρης, 11 εὐιῶτις, 14 σαρκοβρώς, 26 ζυγουλκός). Other words or phrases are distinctly poetic (6 ἐνναίω, 7f. λαΐνοις πύργοις, 8 εὐρεῖα πόλις, 10 ὄμπνιος, 12 οἴνη, 13 ἀκύμων, 14 ἀλληλοκτόνος, see also 9–10 n.) or used innovatively (9 ἀρότροις ἀγκύλοις, 10 μέλαινα . . . βῶλος, 11 ἐργάτης σίδηρος, 20 σπάσας). The total absence of metrical resolutions adds solemnity. There is a scattering of prosaic 'scientific' terms (2 ἀρχὴν καὶ κατάστασιν, 8 ὀχυρόω, 19 ἀλλοιόω, 33 μνημόνευμα).

1–2. ἄνειμι, I shall go back: into the past, as in Eur. *Hcld.* 209; not 'to my previous topic' as in Hdt. 1.140 etc. (*DGE* and others), nor 'turn to my next topic' as in Ar. *Clouds* 1059, Plato Com. fr. 188.11 *PCG*, Plut. *Mor.* 661d (Stephanopoulos 1988, 24), neither of which can be done **first**. **unfold**: as in opening a folded writing tablet, e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 709, Eur. *Hipp.* 985, [Longinus] 30.1.2. **the original constitution of human life: ἀρχὴν καὶ κατάστασιν** is a hendiadys as often, e.g. Dem. 18.188, [Dionys. Hal.] *Rhet.* 1.4, Aristides 50.88 Keil (I.342.9 Jebb); the two words should be not taken separately (the savage life of lines 3–17 and the settled life of lines 18–29) as by Stephanopoulos 24, Gallo 112. In Galen ἡ ἐξ ἀρχῆς κατάστασις is 'the original condition', e.g. *Ars Med.* 1.366.12, 1.375.8 Kühn. Protagoras wrote a treatise known at least later as Περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ καταστάσεως (A 1.41 DK from Diogenes Laertius 9.55), probably about early human life. Diod. 1.8.1 τοὺς δὲ ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεννηθέντας τῶν ἀνθρώπων φασὶν ἐν ἀτάκτῳ καὶ θηριώδει βίῳ καθεστῶτας. On the word κατάστασις and its use in these contexts see Norden 1913, 372 with n. 1, 373f. n. 4.

---

[28] Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 112. See Jacoby's detailed commentary (IIIb (Suppl.) I.442–48) on this and the other relevant sources.

[29] Details in the notes below; cf. Schramm 71–77, Xanthakis-Karamanos 109–14, Stephanopoulos 24–29, Vinagre 124–26.

3. There was once that age: ἦν . . . ποτ' αἰών varies the common ἦν (ποτε) χρόνος, 'there was (once) a time'; cf. Pl. *Prot*. 820c, 'There was once a time (ἦν ποτε χρόνος) when gods existed but human races did not'; Critias(?) F 19.1, 'There was a time (ἦν χρόνος) when human life was disordered and bestial (ἄτακτος καὶ θηριώδης) and subservient to strength'; Orph. fr. 292 (above, footnote 26). For '*that* time when . . . ' cf. *TrGF* adesp. F 620.1, Callim. fr. 192.1, Theocr. 23.33. **[**There is no compelling reason to change mss. ὁπηνίκα to Nauck's ποθ' ἡνίκα: »» Stephanopoulos 24, Gallo 112.**]**

4–6. similar to beasts . . . mountain caves . . . ravines: cf. *Hom.Hymn,* 20.3f., humans once lived 'in mountain caves like beasts (ἄντροις . . . ἐν οὔρεσιν ἠΰτε θῆρες)'; Eur. *Supp.* 201f., 'I praise that god who separated our life from being turbulent and bestial (ἐκ πεφυρμένου καὶ θηριώδους)'; Critias (3 n.), Diodorus (1–2 n.). In Diod. 1.8.7 cave-dwelling is a stage between nomadic life at the mercy of the elements and settled communal life. **ὀρειγενῆ:** lit. 'mountain-born' or 'mountain-grown' (cf. Nicander, *Ther.* 874, almost its only other occurrence). **δυσηλίους:** lit. 'with poor sun', here like ἀνηλίους in [Aesch.] *PV* 452f. (humans originally living ἐν μυχοῖς ἀνηλίοις), Eur. *Ion* 500–2 (the Cave of Pan on the north face of the Acropolis). In Aesch. *Eum.* 396 δυσήλιος denotes the darkness of the Underworld, in [Eur.] *Rhes.* 247 sunless weather. »» LSJ 'δῠσ-'.

6-8. neither roofed dwelling nor broad city etc.: i.e. neither protection nor communal life (τὸν κοινὸν βίον, Diod. 1.8.8, Pl. *Prot.* 322b8 ᾤκουν σποράδην, πόλεις δὲ οὐκ ἦσαν). **λαΐνοις . . . πύργοις:** the epithet belongs to epic and later poetry, especially Euripides (19x: λάϊνοι πύργοι are the walls of Troy, *Tro.* 4, *IA* 773). **εὐρεῖα . . . πόλις:** Τροίη εὐρείη is an epic formula (*Iliad* 4x*, Odyssey* 5x, Bacchyl. *Dith.* 15.40 δι' εὐρεῖαν πόλιν . . . Τρώων; Stephanopoulos 25f.). **[ἐνναίοντες** is transitive as in Ap.Rhod. 1.1076, Callim. *Hymn*. 4.15, *Aetia* fr. 75.60 and later (*DGE* 'ἐνναίω', Harder on Callim. fr. 75.60). **στεγήρης**, 'equipped with covering', varies the usual στεγανός.**]**

9–10. the black clod . . . cleft by angular ploughs: agriculture with its associated activities (ploughing, animal husbandry, food storage) defines the settled, self-sustaining human life, e.g. in Soph. *Ant.* 337–41, Eur. *Supp.* 205–7, Diod. 1.8.6f., Dicaearchus frs 54–56 Mirhady. Athens officially claimed to have received the gift of agriculture from Demeter at Eleusis and to have generously shared it and thus raised the rest of mankind from the 'bestial life' (θηριώδης βίος), e.g. Isocrates 4.28f., *IG* II^2 1134.16–23 (c. 117/6 BC). **ἀρότροις . . . ἐτέμνετο . . . βῶλος:** cf. *Od.* 18.374 εἴκοι δ' ὑπὸ βῶλος ἀρότρῳ, 'and should the clod yield beneath the plough' (»» Stephanopoulos 26). **ἀρότροις ἀγκύλοις** varies καμπύλ(α) ἄροτρα of *Hom.Hymn.* 2.308, Solon fr. 13.47 *IEG* (»» Stephanopoulos 2014, 196). **μέλαινα βῶλος** varies the familiar γαῖα/γῆ μέλαινα 'black earth' of epic and later poetry. **καρποῦ . . . ὀμπνίου, the bountiful harvest:** in Hellenistic poetry ὄμπνιος typically describes harvests,

fertile fields etc. or the grain-giving goddess Demeter (earlier only Soph. F 246, a cloud). The etymology is uncertain and was disputed in antiquity: »» LSJ ‘ὄμπνιος’, Pfeiffer on Callimachus fr. 287 (Hollis on Callim., *Hecale* fr. 111).

11–12. nor did hard-working iron etc.: grain and wine, the gifts of Demeter and Dionysus (lines 23–25), are the distinctive staples of human life (e.g. Eur. *Bacch.* 274–83). **ἐργάτης** is normally a human or animal worker, especially one involved in agricultural work (ἔργα), here used adjectivally (»» LSJ I.2). **the Bacchant vine:** εὐιῶτις, derived from the Bacchic cry εὐοῖ, is found only here, εὐιώτης in *Lyr. adesp.* 926(a) *PMG* (22 Powell) ἁβροπαρθένους εὐιώτας χοροὺς, ‘Bacchant choruses of delicate maidens’.

13. earth was barren: the earth remained ‘unpregnant’ because it was not ploughed and seeded by human agriculture (cf. lines 23–26). **ἀκύμων** has this sense only here and at Eur. *Andr.* 158, Aristophanes fr. 765 *PCG* and twice in Galen; usually ‘waveless, calm, untroubled’. **†κωφεύουσα ῥέουσα†:** presumably elaborating **ἀκύμων** but unmetrical and almost meaningless (lit. ‘keeping quiet, flowing’). **[**Conjectures, remote from the paradosis: κοὐδὲν ἐκφύουσα ‘and producing nothing’, Grotius; κοὐ τροφὴν φέρουσα ‘and not bearing nourishment’, Tyrwhitt; more in Nauck’s apparatus. Haupt (1870, 327f.) suggested that the line-end concealed ἀργοῦσα γῆ ‘lying idle/fallow’, cf. Xen. *Cyr.* 1.6.44 γῆν ἀργοῦσαν.**]**

14–15. βοραὶ . . . ἀλληλοκτόνοι, food from mutual slaughter: βορά is usually the food of carnivores and is apt for cannibal feasts, e.g. cf. Eur. *Cyc.* 127 βορᾷ . . . ἀνθρωποκτόνῳ, 249 ἀνθρώπων βορᾶς, Aesch. *Ag.* 1220, 1597 (Thyestes’ banquet), Eur. *IT* 388 (Tantalus feeding Pelops’ flesh to the gods); the plural **βοραί** is almost unique (Justin Martyr, *Apologia I* 26.7 ἀνθρωπείων σαρκῶν βοράς). **σαρκοβρῶτας . . . δαῖτας, carnivorous feasts:** σαρκοβρώς is a unique coinage, cf. Eur. *Cretans* F 472.12 ὠμοφάγους δαῖτας. σάρξ/σάρκες in tragedy nearly always denotes human flesh, often dead (Schramm 73). **[**The adj. ἀλληλοκτόνος and related ἀλληλοκτονεῖν, ἀλληλοκτονία are prosaic, only here in poetry. Wecklein (1890, 52) adjusted mss. βοραὶ δὲ σαρκοβρῶτες ἀλληλοκτόνους etc. (‘carnivorous food afforded them feasts from mutual slaughter’) to give interlaced word-order and a more logical sequence (mutual killing led to feasts of human flesh).**]**

15–16. Law was weak, and Violence shared Zeus’s throne: law and justice are indispensable for the stability and prosperity of human communities, whether imposed by Zeus (Hesiod, Aesch. F 281a [the ‘Dikê fragment’], Pl. *Prot.* 320c–323a etc.) or learned through human experience (Anon. Iambl. quoted below on 21f., Soph. *Ant.* 355f., Critias(?) F 19.5–7). Nomos and Bia are personified as deities associated with Zeus. In this primitive age Bia holds the position later held by Zeus’s daughter Dikê (Justice), e.g. Aesch. F 281a.10, Soph. *OC* 1382, Orph. fr. 23 Kern = 33 Bernabé in [Dem.] 25.11, Anaxarchus A 3.8ff. DK in Plut. *Alex.* 52. In Hesiod, *Works* 255–62 Dikê is only a suppliant

sitting before Zeus and begging him to punish injustices. The idea that Bia was once enthroned beside Zeus is not incongruous. In Hesiod, *Theogony* 385–403 Zêlos (Rivalry), Nikê (Victory), Kratos (Power) and Bia are all children of Styx who reside close to Zeus and travel everywhere with him, having been guaranteed their original prerogatives (*timai*) by him after the Titanomachy; they are still an essential part of his regime although he now chooses to be guided by justice rather than violence. In the first scene of [Aesch.] *Prometheus Bound* Kratos and Bia nail Prometheus to the rock on Zeus's instructions. Other deities could be imagined as enthroned with Zeus, e.g. Themis (Pind. *Ol.* 8.21, Anaxarchus above), Nomos (Orph. fr. 160 Kern/247 Bernabé), Aidôs (Soph. *OC* 1267). »» West on Hes. *Works* 259.

{17. the weak one was the superior ones' food}: a lame insertion explaining the sense of 14f. Verse 16 is clearly a broad conclusion: Violence prevailed.

18–22. For the importance of **Time** in the development of human culture see e.g. Xenophanes B 18 DK (above, footnote 24), Hippocrates, *On Ancient Medicine* 2, Dicaearchus frs 54–56 Mirhady, Diogenes Oenoand. fr. 12 Smith, cols. 1.13–2.11 ('then time as it proceeded put the loom into their thoughts . . . all *technai* were generated by needs [χρεῖαι] and experiences [περιπτώσεις] along with time').

18. Time who begets and nurtures all: τίκτων . . . καὶ τρέφων sums up the process of parenting, cf. *Iliad* 22.421 (father), *Odyssey* 2.131, 12.134, 23.325 (mothers), Eur. *El.* 969 (mother: see Cropp *ad loc.*), Aesch. *Cho.* 127f. (Earth), Pl. *Menex.* 237c2 (homeland); in Xen. *Mem.* 2.2.5 the mother διενεγκοῦσα καὶ τίκτουσα τρέφει τε καὶ ἐπιμελεῖται, 'carries, gives birth, then nurtures and cares for' the child. **Χρόνος, Time** is the parent of all because everything in this world is generated within a framework of time; cf. Pindar, *Ol*. 2.17 Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατήρ, Eur. *Hcld*. 899 Αἰών . . . Χρόνου παῖς (Aiôn is bounded time), *Supp*. 787f. Χρόνος παλαιὸς πατὴρ . . . ἁμερᾶν, Soph. *OC* 618 Χρόνος τεκνοῦται νύκτας ἡμέρας τε: »» Wilamowitz on Eur. *HF* 669.[30] That **Time** provided teachers (20–22) is a variation on several commonplaces: Time is a teacher (Soph. *OC* 7f., Philemon fr. 136 *PCG*), Time brings hidden things to light (Soph. *Aj.* 646 with Finglass's note), we learn in time through long experience or persistent searching (Xenophanes B 18, Eur. F 291.3, F 303.3–5, Chaeremon **F 21** n.).

19. changed human life about: i.e., made it the reverse of what it had been (»» LSJ 'ἔμπαλιν' II.1). **[**The verb ἀλλοιόω is common in philosophical and

[30] On personifications of time in 6th–5th C. literature see in general De Romilly 1968, 34–58. In Near Eastern-influenced Orphic accounts Time emerged as the primeval cosmogonic deity, though how and when this happened is disputed (»» West 1983b, 70, 103–8 and index 'Chronos', 'Time-cosmogony'; Brisson 1985, 1997; Betegh 2004, 140–46, 157f. with n. 117).

scientific writers; in poetry only Eur. *Supp.* 944, Lycophr. *Alex.* 195, Euphron fr. 9.5 *PCG* (3rd C.) and here.**]**

20. Prometheus's concern: i.e. his gifts of intelligence and technical skills (*technai*) detailed most fully in [Aesch.] *PV* 442–506. According to Plato's Protagoras, Prometheus simply gave humans the means of developing *technai* (τὴν ἔντεχνον σοφίαν σὺν πυρί, 'technical wisdom along with fire') and it was left to Zeus to add the political wisdom (*aidôs* and *dikê*) necessary for constructive communal life (Pl. *Prot.* 320c–323a). Moschion's speaker leaves Prometheus's contribution vague and optional. **[σπάσας, inducing**: σπάω (lit. 'draw, wrest') occasionally refers to emotions etc. seizing people (LSJ 'σπάω' II.5, cf. 'ἐπισπάω' 2, 4, Finglass on Soph. *El.* 561). Conjectures such as πλάσας 'shaping' (Meineke), παρείς 'permitting', πορών 'providing' (Schramm) are not needed.**]**

21f. necessity (ἀνάγκην) or . . . nature herself (αὐτὴν τὴν φύσιν): the two are actually complementary; necessity (the need to survive) compels humans to find the way of life that matches their nature and capacities. Anon. Iambl. 6.2, 'If humans are naturally (ἔφυσαν) incapable of living singly and came together yielding to necessity (τῇ ἀνάγκῃ), and their whole life and all their crafts (τεχνήματα) are directed towards this, and it is not possible for them to be with each other and live lawlessly (ἐν ἀνομίᾳ) . . . because of these necessities (ἀνάγκας) we must accept that law and justice reign amongst humans and can never be removed; for they are strongly bound into us by our nature (φύσει)'. Epicurus, *Epist.* 1.75.1f., 'We must assume also that our nature (φύσις) was taught and impelled (ἀναγκασθῆναι) to many things by circumstances themselves'. Diodorus 1.8.9, 'necessity (χρεία) itself was the teacher of everything for humans, guiding a naturally well-endowed creature (εὐφυεῖ ζῴῳ) appropriately in the learning of each thing and having as collaborators for all of them hands and reason (λόγος) and alertness of mind (ψυχῆς ἀγχίνοιαν). »» Xanthakis-Karamanos 112f., Vinagre 139–42.

τῇ μακρᾷ τριβῇ, in its long passing (lit. 'wearing away'): cf. Soph. F 664 γῆρας διδάσκει πάντα καὶ χρόνου τριβή, 'old age and the passing of time teach everything', Pl. *Rep*. 493b καταμαθὼν δὲ ταῦτα πάντα συνουσίᾳ τε καὶ χρόνου τριβῇ, 'learning all these things through familiarity and the passing of time'); LSJ 'τριβή' IV. The word also suggests τριβή as 'practice, application' (LSJ II), e.g. Pl. *Epist.* 7.344b μανθάνειν . . . μετὰ τριβῆς πάσης καὶ χρόνου πολλοῦ, 'to learn with concentrated practice and much time'; Aristot. *Soph.Elench.* 184b τριβῇ ζητοῦντες πολὺν χρόνον ἐπονοῦμεν, 'we strove for a long time, seeking it through practice'.

23–25. καρπὸς ἡμέρου τροφῆς etc., the harvest of holy Demeter's cultivated food: or possibly 'the fruit of holy Demeter's gentle nurture', but ἥμερος τροφή is usually cultivated ('tame') food (LSJ 'ἥμερος' I.2), e.g. Theophrastus fr. 548A.27 Fortenbaugh (= Porphyry, *On Abstinence* 2.5.6), Diod. 1.8.5, Philo

On the Decalogue 160 καρπῶν ἡμέρου τροφῆς. **Δήμητρος ἀγνῆς:** cf. Hes. *Works* 465, *Hom.Hymn.* 2.439 etc. (»» Richardson on *Hom.Hymn.* 2.203). **the Bacchic god's sweet stream:** cf. Eur. *Cyc*. 496 βοτρύων φίλαισι πηγαῖς, 'the grape-bunch's friendly streams, *Iph.Taur*. 164 Βάκχου τ' οἰνηρὰς λοιβάς, 'Bacchus's vinous liquor'.

25–29. The topics of lines 3–13 are reviewed in reverse order. Life **similar to beasts** (4) has become life in **a gentle state** (29). **[26**. The word ζυγουλκός is again unique, the verb ἀροτρεύω not seen elsewhere before 3rd C. poetry except in Pherecydes fr. 105 Jacoby/Fowler (according to Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 4.133), nor the noun ἀροτρεύς 'ploughman' from which it is derived.**]**

30–31. thence did Law determine (ὥρισεν Νόμος): (δι)ὁρίζω often has this sense, e.g. Lysias 2.19, Lycurg. *Leocr.* 27 (»» Cropp 2020a, 48). Moschion leaves the origin of law and justice unexplained but implies that it was a consequence of the establishment of settled communities rather than a divine gift (cf. 15–16 n.). **and give . . . a portion of dust** (lit. 'apportion dust')**:** the symbolic act required of anyone coming upon an unburied body, famously performed by Antigone for Polynices, Soph. *Ant.* 256. Schol. *Ant.* 255 says that neglecting an unburied body was subject to a curse maintained by an Athenian priestly family, the Bouzygai, and originating with their ancestor Bouzyges, 'Ox-yoker', who was also said to have been the first to yoke oxen for ploughing (cf. 25f. here; »» Parker 1996, 286f.). **[**The verb ἐπιμοιράομαι is found only twice elsewhere in ancient literary texts: ps.-Phocylides 99 γαῖαν ἐπιμοιρᾶσθαι ἀταρχύτοις νεκύεσσιν ('give a portion of earth to untended bodies'), Philo, *Moses* 283f. μηδὲν μέρος ὑπολειπόμενοι τῶν σωμάτων, ὃ ταφῆς ἐπιμοιράσεται ('leaving no part of their bodies that might partake in burial'. LSJ 'ἐπιμοιράομαι' is corrected in LSJ Supp.**]**

[33. a reminder of that former impious feast: the word **μνημόνευμα** is rare and prosaic, in poetry only here and Menand. *Periceir*. 796. Stephanopoulos 28f. notes very similar phrasing in Eur. *Cyc*. 31, 289, 693, Soph. *Aj.* 1293f., Lycophr. *Alex.* 1200 and suggests that mss. δυσσεβές ('an impious reminder of that former feast') could be retained with δυσσεβές taken as a transferred epithet, but the hyperbaton θοίνης . . . δυσσεβοῦς is stylish and the corruption very easy.**]**

F 7

Possibly from *Pheraeans*, although the first verse is perhaps too like **F 3**.1 to be from the same play (cf. above, p. 249). **F 3** asserts the futility of abusing corpses. **F 7** does so with a supporting argument, that corpses can feel nothing. This is implicit in Apollo's complaint in *Iliad* 24.53 (κωφὴν . . . γαῖαν, quoted above on **F 3**) and explicit in Aesch. *Phrygians* F 266.1–3 καὶ τοὺς θανόντας εἰ θέλεις εὐεργετεῖν | εἶτ' οὖν κακουργεῖν, ἀμφιδεξίως ἔχει | ⟨ ⟩ | καὶ μήτε χαίρειν μήτε λυπεῖσθαι βροτούς ('if you want to treat the dead well or treat them ill, it makes no difference; for mortals . . . *(a verse lost)* . . . and feel neither joy nor

pain'); Eur. *Antigone* F 176.3–5, τίς γὰρ πετραῖον σκόπελον οὐτάζων δορὶ | ὀδύναισι δώσει, τίς δ' ἀτιμάζων νέκυν, | εἰ μηδὲν αἰσθάνοιντο τῶν παθημάτων; ('Who can cause pain in a rocky crag by wounding it with a spear, who in a corpse by dishonouring it, if they felt nothing of what they suffered?'); Soph. *Ant.* 1030, τίς ἀλκὴ τὸν θανόντ' ἐπικτανεῖν; ('What prowess is there in re-killing the dead?'). »» Stephanopoulos 54–59.

1–2. αἰκίζειν, abusing: see above on **F 3**.1. **ὑβρίζειν, insulting:** the word implies physical mistreatment intended to humiliate the dead man; cf. Soph. *Aj.* 1092 (Menelaus a *hybristês* towards the dead), Eur. *Pho.* 1663 (Antigone insists on the principle, μὴ 'φυβρίζεσθαι νεκρούς). **τὴν ἄναυδον γαῖαν, the voiceless earth:** a variation on Homer's κωφὴν γαῖαν. The dead are often 'voiceless' in epitaphs (Stephanopoulos 56). They are 'earth' in Soph. *El.* 245 'earth and nothing', Eur. F 532 'earth and shadow' (Xanthakis-Karamanos 121).

3–5. Once sensation etc.: a philosophical statement combining technical terms (**αἴσθησις**, **κρίνουσα**, **θᾐδίονα καὶ τἀνιαρὰ**, **τάξιν εἴληφεν**) with poetic phrasing: a long hyperbaton (**ἡ κρίνουσα . . . αἴσθησις**), interlaced word-order with alliteration (**ἡ κρίνουσα . . . φροῦδος αἴσθησις φθαρῇ**), hyperbaton again with rhyme (**κωφοῦ . . . πέτρου**). The physiology of sensation (**αἴσθησις**) as the source of pleasure and pain was an old subject of enquiry, e.g. Empedocles A 86.5–8, 34f. DK (from Theophrastus, *On Sensation*), Aristot. *De anima* 413b22 ὅπου μὲν γὰρ αἴσθησις, καὶ λύπη τε καὶ ἡδονή ('where there is sensation there too are pain and pleasure'), cf. 414b3. Moschion's formulation may reflect the Epicurean view that pleasure and pain are the sole criteria (cf. **κρίνουσα** here) of what is truly good or bad for us (Pohlenz 1954, II.192, Stephanopoulos 57). For Epicurus the sensing of pleasure and pain is essentially a function of the soul reacting to stimuli from the body; a body deprived of soul has no sensation, nor does soul when wholly separated from a body and thus disintegrated (*Letter* 1.63.10–65.9). **pleasures and pains** (lit. 'both the pleasanter and the painful'): normally ἡδονὰς καὶ λύπας, but the pairing of ἡδέα and ἀνιαρά is not uncommon, e.g. Eur. *Med.* 1095, Pl. *Prot.* 351c3–d5, 358a5 (»» Stephanopoulos 57f.). **φροῦδος**, lit. 'departed, gone' (< προ-όδος), hence 'lost', 'vanished', 'destroyed', 'dead' according to context, almost exclusively poetic in classical Greek. **has attained the condition:** more philosophical/scientific language (Stephanopoulos 59). τάξις is literally ordering or arrangement, hence order, an ordered position or class (Aristot. *MM* 1.33.16 τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τάξιν, 'the condition of manhood'; LSJ 'τάξις' IV.1). **an unfeeling rock:** in this context **κωφοῦ** must mean 'unfeeling' rather than 'deaf' or 'dumb', as in *Iliad* 24.53 ('unfeeling earth'), Eur. *Ant.* F 176.3–5 (the inert 'rocky crag'), both quoted above. **[3.** The comparative **ᾐδίονα** seems to be a metrical convenience. The crasis (τὰ ᾐ-) is not exactly paralleled, but Aristophanes has θᾐμέτερον/-ου, θᾔμισυ (also Men. *Dysc.* 738), θᾐπάτιον, θᾐρῷον (all τὸ ᾐ-); cf. θαιερά (τὰ ἰ-), Eur. *Cyc.* 265. θοἰμάτιον/

θαἰμάτια (τὸ ἰ-, τὰ ἰ-) are frequent in comedy and 4th C. prose. See also on Ezechiel, p. 321 below.**]**

F 8

Stobaeus's chapter 'That it is easier to advise others than oneself' also includes Sophocles F 576, Eur. *Alc.* 1078, F 44, F 102 and some excerpts from comedy. See also [Aesch.] *PV* 263–65, 335f., Eur. *HF* 1249, [Plut.] *Mor.* 118b–c and proverbial uses (»» Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 162). Stephanopoulos 60ff. notes the rhetorical sophistication of Moschion's version and a concentration of Euripidean phrasing: αἶνος as a 'saying' (Eur. F 25.1 = 333.1, F 321.1, F 508.1), τὸν πέλας and αὐτόν contrasted (*Med.* 86, *Hipp.* 441f. etc.), βραχὺς πόνος (~ *Med.* 367, *Hipp.* 96, *Bacch.* 1279), πάντων μέγιστον τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις (~ F 403.7, F 1030, imitated in com. adesp. 1048.3 *PCG*).

1. αἶνος ἀνθρώπων ὅδε resembles Archilochus fr. 174.1 *IEG* αἶνός τις ἀνθρώπων ὅδε, but αἶνος there is a 'fable' as in Archil. fr. 185.1, Hes. *Works* 202 etc. **[τρανός, accurate:** this form (rather than τρανής) is usually prosaic; on the etymology see Fantuzzi on *Rhes.* 40. In line 3 the reading αὐτὸν gives 'to advise oneself to bear the abuse is the greatest burden', but it is the bearing, not the advising that is burdensome.**]**

F 9

The speaker describes a king of Argos who has fallen from power and now humbles himself as a suppliant, arriving in a land where the people receive him with sympathy. The excerpt is quoted in Stobaeus's chapter on the insecurity of human fortune with no indication of its original context; neither the land nor the king nor the reason for his fall is evident. Ribbeck suggested Adrastus of Argos arriving in Athens with the mothers of the Seven to seek help in recovering the bodies of their sons fallen at Thebes as in Euripides' *Suppliant Women*,[31] but then the description should be focused on the mothers rather than the king; and in Euripides' play at least Adrastus was not a former king and did not get much sympathy in Athens. The excerpt has usually been assigned to a report-speech (Welcker 1841, 1049, Meineke 108), but there are other possibilities such as an *exemplum* from a persuasive or epideictic speech.[32] »» Stephanopoulos 1988, 32–35.

---

[31] Ribbeck 1875, 154f.: cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, 85, Stephanopoulos 1988, 32 n. 50). Implausible suggestions in Wagner 17f. (Thyestes at Sicyon), Ravenna 767–69 (a deposed monarch seeking restoration), Walker 1923, 226 (Archelaus in Macedonia), Kotlińska-Toma 139–41 (Danaus and his daughters in Argos).

[32] Ribbeck (1875, 153–55) assigned it to his reconstruction of *Themistocles*, with Themistocles' friends or family recalling the Athenians' assistance to Adrastus as a precedent for the burial of Themistocles' body in Attica.

1. . . . with whom (*or* which?): either female companions (like the daughters of Oedipus in Soph. *OC*) or an abstraction such as ἀτιμίαι ('dishonours, indignities': Meineke 108). **[**Meineke's **σὺν αἶσι** makes good sense of the confused readings in the mss. of Stobaeus, probably caused by the quotation's starting in mid-sentence.**]**

2. humble after his royal throne: θρόνων is an 'aggrandizing' plural. For ἐκ 'after' see LSJ 'ἐκ' II.2 and especially Eur. *Hec.* 55 ἐκ τυραννικῶν δόμων 'after a royal palace', *El.* 305 βασιλικῶν ἐκ δωμάτων 'after a royal habitation', F 153 (5–6 n. below): »» Stephanopoulos 1988, 33. **[λιτός, humble:** of a person as e.g. Callim. *Hymn* 2.10, fr. 384.32 (»» Williams on *Hymn* 2.10, Stephanopoulos 1988, 33, 37).

3. προσίκτην θαλλόν, a suppliant branch: usually an olive-branch, e.g. Aesch. *Eum.* 43f., cf. *Cho.* 1035 ξύν τῷδε θαλλῷ . . . προσίξομαι, Soph. *OT* 3 ἱκτηρίοις κλάδοισιν, Eur. *Supp.* 10 ἱκτῆρι θαλλῷ (Collard on *Supp.* 8–11a). **[**The adj. προσίκτης uniquely here (noun προσίκτωρ Aesch. *Eum.* 119, 441). **ἠγκαλισμένος:** the verb is rare before the 1st C. AD (Semonides fr. 7.77 *IEG*, Lyc. *Alex.* 142, Meleager *Anth.Pal.* 12.122.2, cf. Eur. *Hcld*. 42 ὑπηγκαλισμένη, *Cyc.* 498 ὑπαγκαλίζων.**]**

4. entered the land etc.: often rendered as 'made his way, casting a pitiable eye down to the ground', but **ὄμμα συμπαθὲς φέρων** naturally means **bearing a pitiable countenance**, cf. Eur. *Pho*. 1531 ἀλαὸν ὄμμα φέρων 'bearing an unseeing eye', adesp. F 415 στείχει . . . ὄμμ' ἔχων ἰδεῖν πικρόν 'He comes with countenance harsh to see'. **[συμπαθές** means almost uniquely 'evoking pity' (cf. LSJ 'συμπαθής' I.2) but is unlikely to have displaced a more expected word such as συννεφές, 'clouded, gloomy' (Nauck, cf. Eur. *Pho.* 1307).**]**

5–6. that fortune's splendours etc.: cf. Eur. F 153 'god hid his blessedness away after those former spendours (ἐκ κείνων τῶν ποτε λαμπρῶν)', Menander fr. 89 *PCG* 'that he might regain his splendours (τὰ λαμπρά) meeting with a change of fortune', Menand. *Monost*. 862 'How easily do brilliant fortunes (αἱ λαμπραὶ τύχαι) fall'; a cliché in later Greek prose. **no sure possession:** cf. Soph. F 201d ἀρετῆς βέβαιαι δ' εἰσὶν αἱ κτήσεις μόνης, 'Only virtue's possessions are secure'.

8–9. every one stretched out a hand etc.: rather than turning away because of his misfortune: cf. Thuc. 1.16.4 δυστυχοῦντες οὐ προσαγορευόμεθα 'In misfortune we are not spoken to' (Stephanopoulos 34f.), Soph. *OT* 1337ff. τί δῆτ' ἐμοὶ . . . προσήγορον ἔτ' ἔστ' ἀκούειν ἡδονᾷ; 'What greeting can I still hear with pleasure?' (Schramm 1929, 80). **their eyes:** κανθός is an anatomical term for the corner of the eye, used occasionally as part for whole in Hellenistic poetry (LSJ 'κανθός' I.2).

F 10?

From Clement's discussion of alleged plagiarisms (κλοπαί, 'thefts') amongst pagan Greek authors (cf. Theodectas **F 1a** n.), and a more than usually silly

example. This is one more variation on the topic of mortals' vulnerability to misfortune (cf. Carcinus **F 5a** n., Dionysius **F 2** n., **F 3** n.). Compare e.g. Eur. *HF* 503–5 with Bond's note, *Supp.* 953f., *Bacch.* 910f. and especially *Hec.* 627f. κεῖνος ὀλβιώτατος | ὅτῳ κατ' ἦμαρ τυγχάνει μηδὲν κακόν 'that man is most fortunate whom day by day no ill befalls'. **practises an even life:** i.e. a life avoiding the ups and downs of changing fortune. For ἀσκεῖν βίον 'practising' a certain kind of life cf. Eur. *Antiope* F 201.2, Diod. 3.64.7, [Plut.] *Mor.* 10b5, *DGE* ἀσκέω II.2.c (often in later Greek).

Clement cites 'Moschion the comic poet' and the excerpt appears as the only fragment of a comic Moschion in *PCG* VII, though not in previous editions of the comic fragments. It seems unlikely that Clement (or his source for this collection of 'thefts') would have cited such an obscure poet, and the tone and style are tragic. The Ionic form κεῖνος is frequent in tragedy but unknown in comedy except for a few special instances (Ar. *Wasps* 752, *Thesm.* 785 paratragic, *Peace* 48 an Ionian speaker, Eupolis F 148 *PCG* lyric allusion). This, then, is probably a tragic fragment and Clement's 'comic poet' a casual error (cf. Carcinus **T 3**, Chaeremon **T 1**). Meineke 109f. (followed by Nauck and Snell) diagnosed the error but refused to attribute the fragment to the tragedian Moschion because it contains three resolutions (μακαριώτατος, διὰ τέλους, ὁμαλόν) while the other fragments have none; but there is no reason to suppose that Moschion never used resolutions (above, pp. 243f.) or that he could not have done so for emphasis in a gnomic statement.

F 12

From an anthology of moral excerpts of which many fragments are preserved in *PSI* 1476. For the topic see above on **F 2**. The word δυσπάλαιστος (**hard to wrestle with**) appears in earlier tragic poetry (Aesch. *Supp.* 468, *Cho.* 692, Soph. F 924, Eur. *Alc.* 889, *Supp.* 1108) and is plausibly restored in *TrGF* adesp. F 702 (again from *PSI* 1476); also in Xenophon, *Hell.* 5.2.18.

THE PLEIAD
(*TrGF* 98–106)

Schramm 1929, 4–6; Steffen 1939; Fraser 1972, I.619f. with n. 6; Lowe 2013; Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 48–54; Sistakou 2016, 12–88; Carrara 2017; Hornblower 2019, 95–97. See also below on Homer, Sositheus, Lycophron, Alexander of Aetolia, Philicus.

Most of our information about the group known as the Pleiad comes from the Byzantine scholar George Choeroboscus (9th C.) explaining the metrician Hephaestion's identification of Philicus of Corcyra as one of them (Philicus ***T 2****):*[1]

> ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου ἑπτὰ ἄριστοι γεγόνασι τραγικοί, οὓς Πλειάδα ἐκάλεσαν διὰ τὸ λαμπροὺς εἶναι ἐν τῇ τραγικῇ ὡς τὰ ἄστρα τῆς Πλειάδος. εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι· Ὅμηρος (οὐχ ὁ ποιητής, περὶ τραγικῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος, ἀλλ' ὁ Μυροῦς τῆς ποιητρίας υἱὸς τῆς Βυζαντίας) καὶ Σωσίθεος καὶ Λυκόφρων καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος, Αἰαντιάδης, Σωσιφάνης καὶ οὗτος ὁ Φίλικος. τινὲς ἀντὶ τοῦ Αἰαντιάδου καὶ Σωσιφάνους Διονυσιάδην καὶ Εὐφρόνιον τῇ Πλειάδι συντάττουσιν.
>
> In the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus there were seven outstanding tragedians whom they called the Pleiad because they were distinguished in tragedy like the stars of the Pleiad. They are: Homer (not the poet [i.e. the epic poet], for the topic here is tragedy, but the son of the poetess Myro of Byzantium) and Sositheus and Lycophron and Alexander, Aeantiades, Sosiphanes and this Philicus. Some include Dionysiades and Euphronius instead of Aeantiades and Sosiphanes.[2]

The comment is essentially reproduced in the B Scholia on Hephaestion (p. 279 Consbruch), except that the last sentence with the two alternative names is omitted. Other evidence differs slightly: the A scholia name Homer, Sositheus, Lycophron, Alexander, Philicus and Dionysiades (a seventh name is lost),[3] *and individual entries in the Suda name these six*

---

[1] Choeroboscus, Scholia on Hephaestion, *Enchiridion* 30.21, p. 236 Consbruch = *TrGF* CAT A 5a.

[2] 'Aeantiades' appears only here and in the related Schol. B; elsewhere 'Aeantides' (including Tzetzes: Lycophron **T 1**). The mss. of Strabo (n. 16 below) have 'Dionysides'.

[3] Schol.^{A} Hephaestion, *Enchiridion*, p. 140 Consbruch.

and Sosiphanes.[4] *Thus Homer, Sositheus, Lycophron, Alexander and Philicus are included in all these sources, while Dionysiades is included in two and is one of Choeroboscus's alternatives; he is also named by Strabo (footnote 16 below). If Sosiphanes was the name now missing in Schol. A (as Schramm and Steffen supposed),*[5] *Schol. A will agree exactly with the Suda, but that is not certain.*[6] *Whether there was ever a fully agreed Pleiad remains unclear; more probably there were five generally accepted names and some flexibility in filling the last two places.*

Our sources never call the Pleiad Alexandrian, but the Byzantine ones associate it with the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, who ruled from 283 to 246 BC and attracted scholars, writers and thinkers to Alexandria where he funded the Museum and Library on a lavish scale.[7] *The Suda gives Homer and Sositheus each an* acmê *in the 124th Olympiad (284/3–281/0), and the Suda and Lives of Aratus put Alexander's* acmê *in the 125th (280/79–277/6). These merely synchronize the poets with the beginnings of the rulers' reigns but are consistent with other evidence. Alexander and Lycophron must have been well established as scholars and poets when they were invited to 'correct' the major dramatic texts which the Library had acquired (Alexander* ***T 7****). The Athenian Victors Lists inscription probably listed Homer with a first Dionysia victory near the beginning of the third century, and perhaps Aeantides and Dionysiades as well.*[8] *Sositheus is said to have competed with*

---

[4] See the testimonia for these poets below. John Tzetzes (12th C.) in his *Life of Lycophron* mixes poets famous in other genres with some of the relevant tragedians: see Lycophron **T 1**.

[5] Steffen 20 suggested that Sosiphanes was doubted because he was confused with Sosiphanes I and thus ineligible on chronological grounds, and less plausibly (24) that Aiantiades was merely a scribal error for Dionysiades.

[6] One manuscript of Choeroboscus's commentary (ms. U) ignores Aiantides and Sosiphanes and lists only his alternatives Dionysiades and Euphronius (see Consbruch p. 236, apparatus). Schol. A might have done the same.

[7] Strootman 2010 surveys the role of literature in the culture and politics of the Hellenistic courts. More fully, Strootman 2017.

[8] *IG* II^2 2325 (= *TrGF* DID A 3a), fr. b.16–20 (lines 64–68 of the inscription: »» Millis–Olson 2012, 143, 144, 146, 149 placing these names at the very end of the fourth century or the beginning of the third). *TrGF* lists the five incomplete names as nos 107–111. They include A . [(line 64), OM[(line 66) and Δḭ[(line 67). The only author's name in the entire *TLG* Canon which begins with OM is Homer.

*Homer (Homer **T 3** = Sositheus **T 1**). Philicus too must have been mature when he led the Artists as priest of Dionysus in Ptolemy's grand procession in the 270s (Philicus **T 4**). Thus the leading five (at least) were probably born somewhere near 320, and all may have been already active in the 290s. The Parian Marble has Sosiphanes II born in 306/5 (**T 1**). Euphronius seems to be an outlier living later, and his association with the Pleiad is questionable (below, p. 275). As for output, the Suda lists 45 and 42 tragedies respectively for Homer and Philicus, and 20 titles (not necessarily all his plays) for Lycophron; the others must have been significantly productive to qualify as prominent tragedians. Most if not all were also versatile poets and literary scholars,*[9] *and Homer and Lycophron are known to have come from literary families. But for all this the dramatic remnants are pitifully few: from Sositheus one possibly tragic title with two verses and plots of two satyr-plays with two text-fragments; from Lycophron twenty probably tragic titles with four verses, and slightly fuller information about one satyr-play; and from Alexander one possibly dramatic title.*[10] *There is hardly any information about tragic plots (but see below on the titles of Lycophron and Alexander, pp. 288–90, 298f.).*

*The earliest extant mention of the Pleiad is from Strabo near the beginning of the Christian era. The origin of the term is unknown, but the Suda's statement (cf. Homer **T 1**) that the Pleiad 'hold the second place among tragedians', i.e. after the canonical trio of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, suggests a contemporary or later critical assessment, or perhaps a poetic celebration of Ptolemy's patronage; some such explanation would help to account for the vagueness of the Pleiad's composition.*[11] *At any rate, it is not likely that it was a formal*

---

[9] Homer, Lycophron and Alexander are described in the Suda as γραμματικοί, and Philicus addressed his Demeter-Hymn to γραμματικοί (**T 2** n.). In these contexts the term denotes literary scholars versed in textual analysis, lexicography, metrics etc. as opposed to κριτικοί, 'literary critics': »» Pfeiffer 1968, 157f.; Gutzwiller 2010, 338f.; Montana 2015, 72–74, 149.

[10] The title *Themistocles* and one moralizing couplet might belong to Philicus: see above, p. 230 on Philiscus of Aegina.

[11] For the likely meaning and implications of the name see especially the reassessment of Carrara 2018 with references to earlier views; also recently Kotlińska-Toma 52–54.

association sponsored by Ptolemy, nor that the activities of these poets were essentially tied to Alexandria or Alexandrian culture.[12] *Most if not all came from elsewhere, and only Lycophron, Alexander and Philicus are known to have been employed at Alexandria for any length of time.*[13] *Homer's parents were notable literary figures in Byzantium (**T 2, 5, 5a**), which had longstanding ties with Athens and possessed a theatre and a Dionysia at least by the end of the fourth century (»»* SEHT *II.775f., 779–81); the record of his competing with Sositheus is probably Athenian. Sositheus is commemorated in an Alexandrian epigram (**T 2**), but he probably acquired Athenian citizenship (**T 1**) and the epigram records his contribution to the revival of satyr-drama and his burial there (**T 2** n.). Alexander, from Pleuron in Aetolia, seems to have gravitated to the court of Antigonus Gonatas (**T 2–3**) before being invited to work at the Library. Timon's collaborations with Homer and Alexander (Homer **T 8**) were probably at Chalcedon, Athens or Pella rather than Alexandria (cf. Carrara 111, 115). All these poets may well have enjoyed Ptolemy's patronage at some point in their careers, but all were surely part of a much more widespread literary and theatrical network.*

The idea of an Alexandrian coterie has led to a further assumption, that the tragedies of the Pleiad poets were not (or not primarily) meant for public performance but rather for reading or recitation or some kind of enactment before a sophisticated audience.[14] *There is no positive evidence for this and no good reason to assume that these sophisticated poets could not have composed both erudite poetry and plays appealing to wider audiences, or that patrons such as Antigonus and Ptolemy would not have required them to do so. They may have produced some esoteric dramas (Lycophron's* Menedemus *might be an example), but the*

---

[12] Sistakou for example imagines 'a group of tragic playwrights in the heart of the Museum' (19), possibly hand-picked by the ruler to advance his cultural agenda (67f.), a 'star company of tragedians that would participate in the official ceremonies of the palace . . . , a closed circle of tragedians that would academically reform tragedy in the Museum' (82).

[13] Lowe rightly speaks of 'second careers at the Museum and Library', noting that it 'is unclear whether any . . . was actively writing tragedy during the Alexandrian phase of his career' (Lowe 2013, 348 with n. 24).

[14] e.g. Fantuzzi 1993, 51f. n. 49; Magnelli 1999, 13 n. 14 (ref. Alexander), Fantuzzi–Hunter 2004, 434; Sens 2010, 297. Sistakou (65–69, 221f.) proposes to distinguish the esoteric 'academic' tragedies of the Pleiad from run-of-the-mill productions of others aimed at a mass audience.

evidence suggests that much of their production was designed for conventional public performance and for places other than Alexandria (cf. Carrara 117–20). Homer, Lycophron and Philicus would hardly have composed dozens of tragedies each, nor would the Pleiad have been remembered as the outstanding tragedians of their time and second only to the canonical three, if their plays had been produced for a limited and private audience or readership. The fact that their tragedies were not at the cutting edge of contemporary poetic culture might be a reason — besides the dominance of their Athenian predecessors — why they did not enter the mainstream of later literary tradition.

The five leading poets of the Pleiad are treated individually in the following sections. As for the others:

Aeanti(a)des *(*TrGF *102) is known only from Choeroboscus, Schol. A Hephaestion and Tzetzes (above, p. 270 with notes 2, 5, 6), and not from the Suda.*

Sosiphanes II *(*TrGF *103) is known only from the Parian Marble's record of his birth in 306/5 BC,*[15] *the misplaced sentence in the Suda's entry for Sosiphanes I and Choeroboscus's list, but any of the fragments usually assigned to Sosiphanes I could be his (cf. above, p. 240 on Sosiphanes I* ***[F 6]****).*

Dionysi(a)des *(*TrGF *105) is assigned to the Pleiad in Strabo's list of distinguished men from Tarsus,*[16] *and by the Suda,*[17] *Choeroboscus and Schol. A Hephaestion.*

---

[15] *Marmor Parium* B 22 (= *TrGF* T 1): ἀφ' οὗ Σωσιφάνης ὁ ποιητὴς ἐγέ[νετο *ca. 25 letters* ἔτη ΔΔΔΔΙΙ, ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνη]σ[ι Κ]οροίβου: 'Since the poet Sosiphanes *was born (. . . . . 42 years, C)*oroebus *(being archon at Athens)*'.

[16] Strabo 14.5.15 (= *TrGF* T 2), ποιητὴς τραγῳδίας ἄριστος τῶν τῆς Πλειάδος καταριθμουμένων ('an excellent tragic poet, one of those numbered in the Pleiad').

[17] Suda *δ* 1169 (= *TrGF* T 1), Διονυσιάδης, Φυλαρχίδου, Μαλλώτης, τραγικός. ἦν δὲ οὗτος τῶν τῆς Πλειάδος, καὶ γέγραπται αὐτῷ μεταξὺ ἄλλων καὶ Χαρακτῆρες ἢ Φιλοκώμῳδοι, ἐν ᾧ τοὺς χαρακτῆρας ἀπαγγέλλει τῶν ποιητῶν: 'Dionysiades, son of Phylarchides, from Mallos [55 km from Tarsus], tragedian. He was one of the Pleiad, and his writings include amongst other things *Characters or Comedy-lovers*, in which he describes the poets' characters'. I should think the *Characters or Comedy-lovers* was about the characters portrayed in classic comedies rather than 'the first attempt to distinguish the style of the Attic comic poets' (Pfeiffer 1968, 160) or 'the earliest attested attempt at some form of

Euphronius *(*TrGF *106) is connected with the Pleiad and tragedy only by Choeroboscus. He may be the grammarian and commentator who is cited quite often in the scholia to Aristophanes and elsewhere and is probably the Euphronius who composed a poem to Priapus in the Priapean metre from which Hephaestion quotes three verses.*[18] *He may have been one of Aristophanes of Byzantium's teachers,*[19] *and Choeroboscus says that he and Aristophanes were both teachers of Aristarchus of Samothrace (born c. 215 BC). The 'New Dionysus' named in the Priapean verses may have been Ptolemy IV Philopator, whose reign began in 221.*[20] *These pointers, if reliable, make Euphronius active between say 240 and the early 190s, considerably later than the leading members of the Pleiad. If the tragic poet was the same man, his assignment to the Pleiad was a little eccentric. If not, he like Aeantides is virtually unknown.*

---

overall evaluation and syncrisis of the distinctive qualities of different comedians' (Lowe 2013, 354).

[18] Hephaestion, *Ench.* 16.2, p. 56 Consbruch ('Euphorion' wrongly in the mss.); Choeroboscus, p. 241 Consbruch ('Euphronius the grammarian'); cf. Strabo 8.6.24 ('Euphronius who composed the Priapea'); »» *LGGA*, 'Euphronius'; also Powell 1925, 177, Schramm 60f., and for his scholarly interests Lowe 2013, 354 (who assumes this was the tragedian).

[19] *Suda α* 3933, where 'Euphronidas of Corinth or Sicyon' probably disguises the names Euphronius and Machon (who came from Corinth or Sicyon according to Athenaeus 6.241f): »» Nauck 1848, 2 n. 3, 3 n. 6; Schramm 60.

[20] »» Powell, n. 18 above; Fraser 1972, II.347 n. 117.

HOMER OF BYZANTIUM
(*TrGF* 98)

TrGF 1^2.268f. with *addenda* 1^2.356. Schramm 1929, 15–19; Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 63–66; Carrara 2018, 110f.

*Basic biographical information for 'the younger Homer' is found in several testimonia, most fully in the Suda (**T 1–3**). He was probably born around 320 BC (above, pp. 271f.). Nothing is known of his father Andromachus but the surname Philologos suggests he was a scholar and teacher, and he may also have been a poet.*[1] *Homer's mother Moero*[2] *is much better known as a poet in her own right, listed with other female*

T 1 Suda *o* 253

Ὅμηρος, Ἀνδρομάχου καὶ Μυροῦς Βυζαντίας, γραμματικὸς καὶ τραγῳδιῶν ποιητής· διὸ συνηριθμήθη τοῖς ἑπτά, οἳ τὰ δευτερεῖα τῶν τραγικῶν ἔχουσι καὶ ἐκλήθησαν τῆς Πλειάδος. ἤκμαζεν ὀλυμπιάδι ρκδ΄. ἔγραψε δὲ τραγῳδίας με΄.

T 2 Suda *μ* 1464

Μυρώ, Βυζαντία, ποιήτρια ἐπῶν καὶ ἐλεγείων καὶ μελῶν, Ὁμήρου τοῦ τραγικοῦ μήτηρ, γυνὴ δὲ Ἀνδρομάχου τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος φιλολόγου.

μήτηρ Allatius θυγάτηρ Suda

T 3 Suda *σ* 860 (see Sositheus **T 1**)

Σωσίθεος . . . ἀνταγωνιστὴς Ὁμήρου τοῦ τραγικοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ Μυροῦς τῆς Βυζαντίας . . .

T 4 *See above, p. 270 (*Choeroboscus on Hephaestion).

---

[1] For the term φιλόλογος denoting a 'man of learning' (especially as used by Eratosthenes) see Pfeiffer 1968, 156 n. 3, 158f., Montana 2015, 112. Pfeiffer 159 n. 5 notes that it was not necessarily applied to Andromachus in his lifetime (i.e. before it was adopted by Eratosthenes). Tzetzes calls him a poet (*Hist.* 12.399. 203).

[2] Her name Moero (not Myro as in some sources) is guaranteed by the metre in *Anth.Pal.* 2.410 (**T 5**), 4.1.5 and 9.26.3: »» Powell 1925, 21f.

poets in Meleager's proem to The Garland of Meleager *and elsewhere.*[3] *The epigram on her son's marriage (**T 5a**) suggests that she played an important part in his literary education. The number of his tragedies (**T 1** n.), his association with the Pleiad and the references to him in **T 2–5** suggest that he was mainly remembered as a tragedian, but the Suda's description in **T 1** and Tzetzes' mention of a* Eurypyleia *(**T 9**) indicate that he was more versatile than that. Not a single word of his poetry survives, nor any hint of its content except that one title.*[4]

T 1 Suda

Homer, son of Andromachus and Myro of Byzantium, literary scholar and composer of tragedies; hence he was numbered amongst the seven who hold the second place among tragedians and were called the Pleiad. He was in his prime in the 124th Olympiad (284/1–281/0 BC). He wrote 45 tragedies.

T 2 Suda

Myro, of Byzantium, poetess of both elegies and songs, mother of the tragedian Homer and wife of Andromachus surnamed Philologus.

T 3 Suda, 'Sositheus' (see Sositheus **T 1**)

Sositheus . . . competitor of Homer the tragedian, son of Myro of Byzantium . . .

T 4 *See opposite.*

---

[3] *Anth.Pal.* 4.1.5 with Anyte, Sappho, Nossis and Erinna. Longer and more varied lists in Antipater, *Anth.Pal.* 9.26 and Tatian, *Ad Graecos* 33, who mentions a bronze statue of Moero by Praxiteles' son Cephisodotus. The remnants of her poetry (Powell 1925, 21–23) include two epigrams (*Anth.Pal.* 6.119 = **T 5a**; 6.189), ten hexameters from a mythic narrative *Mnemosyne*, a story of fatal passion from her *Arae* ('*Curses*') summarized by Parthenius 27 (»» Lightfoot 1999, 354f., 520–22) and mentions of a *Hymn to Poseidon* and a story about Amphion receiving his lyre from Hermes.

[4] Attribution to the *Eurypyleia* of the so-called *Epyllium Telephi* (P. Oxy. 2.214: Powell 1925, 76–8, Page 1941, 534–7, Heitsch 1961, 58–60) was suggested by Rostagni (1956, 55, cf. Pellin 2001, 536f.) but is very unlikely ('there is nothing Alexandrian in the style, and the ascription to the 3rd century A.D. is probable enough': Page).

T 5 Christodorus, *Anth.Pal.* 2.407–413

Ἴστατο δ᾽ ἄλλος Ὅμηρος, ὃν οὐ πρόμον εὐεπιάων
θέσκελον υἷα Μέλητος ἐυρρείοντος ὀΐω,
ἀλλ᾽ ὃν Θρηικίῃσι παρ᾽ ἠόσι γείνατο μήτηρ
Μοιρὼ κυδαλίμη Βυζαντιάς, ἣν ἔτι παιδνὴν
ἔτρεφον εὐεπίης ἡρῳΐδος ἴδμονα Μοῦσαι·
κεῖνος γὰρ τραγικῆς πινυτὴν ἠσκήσατο τέχνην,
κοσμήσας ἐπέεσσιν ἐὴν Βυζαντίδα πάτρην.

T 5a(?) Moero of Byzantium, *Anth.Pal.* 6.119

Κεῖσαι δὴ χρυσέαν ὑπὸ παστάδα τὰν Ἀφροδίτας,
βότρυ, Διωνύσου πληθόμενος σταγόνι,
οὐδ᾽ ἔτι τοι μάτηρ ἐρατὸν περὶ κλῆμα βαλοῦσα
φύσει ὑπὲρ κρατὸς νεκτάρεον πέταλον.

T 6 *See Lycophron **T 1***

T 7 *See footnote to **T 9***

T 8 Diogenes Laertius 9.113

ἦν δὲ (*sc.* ὁ Τίμων) . . . φιλογράμματός τε καὶ τοῖς ποιηταῖς μύθους γράψαι ἱκανὸς καὶ δράματα συνδιατιθέναι. μετεδίδου δὲ τῶν τραγῳδιῶν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ καὶ Ὁμήρῳ.

T 9 Ioannes Tzetzes, *Life of Hesiod*, p. 45 Wilamowitz (p. 89 Colonna)

Ὅμηροι γὰρ πολλοὶ γεγόνασιν ἕτεροι ζήλῳ τοῦ παλαιοῦ τὴν κλῆσιν λαμβάνοντες· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦ Φωκέως Ὁμήρου τούτου ἕτερος ὑπάρχει νεώτερος Ὅμηρος. οὗτος ὁ νεώτερος Ὅμηρος ἦν παῖς Ἀνδρομάχου τῷ γένει Βυζάντιος, ὁ τὴν Εὐρυπύλειαν ποιήσας.

T 10? *IG* II^2 2325.66 (*TrGF* DID A 3a.66, cf. *TrGF* no. 109)

ΟΜ[ΗΡΟΣ ?

T 5 Christodorus of Thebes, *Description of the statues in the public gymnasium called Zeuxippos*

And standing there was another Homer — not, I suppose, the prince of eloquence, divine son of fair-flowing Meles, but he who by Thracian shores was borne by the famed Byzantine Moero, whom still in her childhood the Muses nurtured in the knowledge of heroic verse. He practised the sagacious tragic art, adorning with verses his Byzantine homeland.

T 5a(?) Moero of Byzantium

You lie now, grape-bunch, in Aphrodite's golden chamber, filled with the juice of Dionysus. No longer will your mother cast around you her lovely bough and grow fragrant foliage over your head.

T 6 *See Lycophron **T 1***

T 7 *See footnote to **T 9***

T 8 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers, Timon*

(Timon) was . . . a keen writer and good at writing plots for poets and helping them compose plays. He used to give Alexander and Homer a share of his tragedies.

T 9 John Tzetzes, *Life of Hesiod*

There were many Homers who took the name of the early one in emulation; indeed besides this Phocian Homer there is another, younger Homer. This younger Homer was son of Andromachus, Byzantine by birth, the one who composed the *Eurypyleia*.

T 10? Victors Lists inscription (Dionysia, poets)[5]

HOM[EROS ?

[5] See above, p. 271 with n. 8.

Notes on Homer of Byzantium

T 5

From a collection of epigrams composed around 500 AD and preserved as Book 2 of the Palatine Anthology (»» Kaldellis 2007, with pp. 381f. on the statue of the 'other' Homer). The Baths of Zeuxippos (between Hagia Sophia and the Imperial Palace in Byzantium) were destroyed by fire in 532 but later rebuilt. **fair-flowing Meles:** a stream flowing into the Gulf of Smyrna which claimed to be the epic poet's birthplace. **with verses:** i.e. the tragedies implied in the previous line, not an epic such as the *Eurypyleia* as Schramm (17) supposed. For ἔπεα as simply 'poetry' see LSJ 'ἔπος' IVb (and cf. Theodectas **T 2** n.).

T 5a(?)

One of the two extant epigrams by Homer's mother Moero, added to the testimonia for Homer in *TrGF* I^2.356. Taken literally it refers to a bunch of ripe grapes left as an offering in the portico of a temple of Aphrodite and thus no longer under the protection of its 'mother', the vine. A παστάς may however be a bridal chamber or the canopy placed over a bridal bed (properly παστός: »» Fantuzzi 1989, 197–201, Beekes s.v. 'πάσσω'). Snell (1980) therefore interpreted the epigram as addressed by Moero to her son on his marriage: she has nurtured him to maturity both as a man and as a poet, and **filled with the juice of Dionysus** evokes both his sexual maturity and his developing talent as a tragedian (ὑπὸ παστάδα may then mean 'beneath the bridal canopy' rather than 'in the bridal chamber'). Recent discussions overlook Snell's interpretation and take the epigram either literally as a (fictitious) dedication enhanced by funereal language (Tueller 2008, 95f.; Sens 2020, 103f.) or metaphorically as addressed to a newly married girl (Cairns 2016, 341–4).

T 8

The Sceptic Timon of Phlious (c. 320–230 BC: *TrGF* no. 112) is best known for his *Silloi* (philosophical satires in verse) but is said by Diogenes Laertius (9.110) to have composed epics, tragedies, satyr-plays, comedies and *kinaidoi* (pederastic poems). The tragedies may have been parodies in the Cynic manner (cf. above on Diogenes of Sinope and Crates of Thebes, pp. 204f., 231 and on Timon's affinities with the Cynics Long 1978, 74–77).

T 9

Tzetzes was convinced that the epic poet Homer could not have been the loser in the legendary *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* and must have lived much earlier than Hesiod. The bogus Phocian 'Homer son of Euphron' appears only here and in other comments of Tzetzes (Schol. Hes. *Works* 236b; *Hist.* 12.399 = **T 7**; *Allegories of Homer's Iliad*, Prolog. 89–94). Homer of Byzantium's ***Eurypyleia*** is mentioned only here.

SOSITHEUS
(*TrGF* 99)

Texts. TrGF 1[2].269–73 with *addenda* 1[2].356; *MusTr* 206–13, 296f.

Discussions. Schramm 1929, 42–59; Fraser 1972, I.600f. with notes 355–57, 619f. with note 10; Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 93–110; Carrara 2018, 112.

*Satyr-plays (with **T 2**).* Latte 1925, 6–12; Webster 1963, 531–37; Steffen 1979, 87–90; Bing 1988, 39f.; Fortuna 1993; *GrSat* 602–17; Cipolla 2003, 381–420; Cozzoli 2003; Griffith 2008, 73–79, 81; Fantuzzi 2007a, 109–19; 2007b, 490–93; O'Sullivan–Collard 2013, 456–61; Nervegna 2019; *SEHT* II.481–83.

*The Suda's first sentence (**T 1**) probably means that Sositheus came from Alexandria Troas and at some point gained Athenian citizenship; the reference to Syracuse perhaps confuses him with Sosiphanes of Syracuse, or he could have been granted citizenship at Syracuse as well. Dioscorides' epigram (**T 2**) implies that he was buried outside the city of Athens, although its provenance suggests he was also well known at Alexandria.*[1] *The mention of his competing with Homer of Byzantium probably reflects Athenian didascalic records, and an anecdote about his being driven out of the theatre for insulting Cleanthes, the head of the Stoa, presumably refers to the Theatre of Dionysus.*[2]

---

[1] Cf. Webster 1963, 536. Webster's interpretation of the epigram as meaning that Sositheus was buried at Alexandria seems implausible to me, though accepted by e.g. Fantuzzi 2007a, 116, Kotlińska-Toma 94.

[2] *TrGF* T 4 = Diog. Laert. 7.173 quoting the verse οὓς ἡ Κλεάνθους μωρία βοηλατεῖ, 'whom Cleanthes' foolishness herds'. Cleanthes succeeded Zeno as head of the Stoa in 262. *TrGF* I[2].356 (*addenda* to p. 272) adds as F 4a?? an incompletely preserved anecdote from Philodemus's history of the Stoic school (P. Herc. 1018, ed. Dorandi 1994, col. 24) in which Arcesilaus (contemporary head of the Academy) reproved 'someone' quoted as having mocked Cleanthes for being unwilling or unable to formulate an extended argument. Gallo (1978, building on a suggestion of von Arnim) argued that the quotation was in verse and from a satyr-play of Sositheus, but (as Cipolla 2003, 416f. notes) his metrical analysis is implausible and the 'someone' can hardly be Sositheus, who has already been named in col. 22, probably in connection with the anecdote recorded by Diogenes Laertius. Dorandi (1994, 153) suggested that the quotation might be a paraphrase of comic verses, comparing Alexis F 99 *PCG*.

The Suda credits Sositheus with a variety of poetry and prose writings, but the few remaining traces are nearly all related to satyr-drama and Dioscorides' epigram gives the impression that this was the area of his most significant work (see below on ***T 2****). The best represented play,* Daphnis or Lityerses *(F 1a–3 including plot summaries and*

T 1 Suda *σ* 860

Σωσίθεος, Συρακούσιος ἢ Ἀθηναῖος, μᾶλλον δὲ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῆς Τρωϊκῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας· τῶν τῆς Πλειάδος εἷς, ἀνταγωνιστὴς Ὁμήρου τοῦ τραγικοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ Μυροῦς τῆς Βυζαντίας· ἀκμάσας κατὰ τὴν ρκδ΄ Ὀλυμπιάδα· γράψας δὲ καὶ ποιήματα καὶ καταλογάδην.

ρκδ΄ Pearson ρξδ΄ (124/3–121/0 BC) Sud.

T 2 Dioscorides, *Anth.Pal.* 7.707

Κὴγὼ Σωσιθέου κομέω νέκυν, ὅσσον ἐν ἄστει
ἄλλος ἀπ' αὐθαίμων ἡμετέρων Σοφοκλῆν,
Σκίρτος ὁ πυρρογένειος. ἐκισσοφόρησε γὰρ ὠνὴρ
ἄξια Φλιασίων, ναὶ μὰ χορούς, Σατύρων·
κἠμὲ τὸν ἐν καινοῖς τεθραμμένον ἤθεσιν ἤδη
ἤγαγεν εἰς μνήμην πατρίδ' ἀναρχαΐσας,
καὶ πάλιν εἰσώρμησα τὸν ἄρσενα Δωρίδι Μούσῃ
ῥυθμόν, πρός τ' αὐδὴν ἑλκόμενος μεγάλην
†ἑπτὰ δέ μοι ἐρσων τύπος οὐ χερὶ† καινοτομηθεὶς
τῇ φιλοκινδύνῳ φροντίδι Σωσιθέου.

6 πατρίδος ἀρχαΐσας Latte 9 εὖαδέ (Salmasius) μοι θύρσων (Jacobs) τύπος αὖ χερὶ Beckby θύρσων τύπος οὐν χερὶ Cozzoli

T 3 *See above, p. 270 (Choeroboscus on Hephaestion).*

twenty-one lines of the prologue) was very probably a satyr-play (»» GrSat 605 n. 3, *Cozzoli, O'Sullivan–Collard), and the same is no doubt true of the play that told the story of Crotus (*TrGF *T 5).*[3] The verse which supposedly offended Sositheus's audience, if genuine, will also have come from a satyr-play. Only* ***F 1*** *is likely to represent a tragedy.*

T 1 Suda

Sositheus, of Syracuse or Athens, but rather an Alexandrian of Alexandria in the Troad; one of the Pleiad, competitor of the tragedian Homer, son of Myro of Byzantium; in his prime in the 124th Olympiad (284/3–281/0 BC); wrote both verse-compositions and in prose.

T 2 Dioscorides, epitaph for Sositheus

I too watch over the body of Sositheus, as in the city another of our brothers watches over Sophocles, I, tawny-bearded Skirtos. The man wore the ivy worthily — yes, by the choruses! — of the satyrs of Phlious. I had been raised in new habits, but he led me to recall my ancestral land, going back to the old ways. Once again I imposed the masculine character on the Dorian Muse, and drawn towards loud declaiming . . . *(meaningless text)* . . . , newly shaped by the audacious thinking of Sositheus.

T 3 *See opposite.*

[3] Crotus ('Clapping') was the son of Eupheme ('Respectful Silence'), the nurse of the Muses, and lived with them on Mount Helicon. He learned to hunt with a bow and also invented clapping to show his appreciation of the Muses' singing. They rewarded him by persuading Zeus to deify him as the constellation Sagittarius ('Archer') in which he appears as a man with a horse's limbs and tail 'like the Satyrs' (the constellation was also known as Centaurus). The story is ascribed to Sositheus in commentaries on Aratus's *Phaenomena* and other astronomical sources (cf. Eratosthenes, *Catasterisms* 28 where he is not named). Some Latin sources cite 'Sositheus the tragic poet', but that does not mean that this was not a satyr-play. »» Cipolla 2003, 418–20.

ΑΕΘΛΙΟΣ

The play's content can only be guessed from its title. Aethlius's place in the mythical ancestry of the Greek peoples was stated in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women *(see [Hes.] fr. 10a.58–64 M–W = 10.58–64 Most with Apollodorus 1.49.5, 1.56.1) and is elaborated in Pausanias's account of the history of the people of Elis (Paus. 5.1.3–8). He was a son of Zeus by Protogeneia, a daughter of the flood-survivors Deucalion and Pyrrha, and married a daughter of Aeolus (a son of Hellen, so their descendants were defined as Hellenic). Their son Endymion, who has his own mythology, was father of Aetolus, eponym of the region of Aetolia and father of Calydon and Pleuron, eponyms of its two main cities (cf. Vol. 1, pp. 36f. on Phrynichus's* Women of Pleuron*). Aethlius was the founder of the Olympic Games and of the practice of competitive athletics ('a hypostasis of a Zeus Aethlios', West 1985, 60 n. 67, Fowler 2013,*

F 1 Stobaeus 4.10.18

εἷς μυρίους ὄρνιθας αἰετὸς σοβεῖ,
λαῶν τε δειλῶν πλῆθος εὖ τραφεὶς ἀνήρ.

AETHLIUS

133). He and Endymion were thus Elean in origin, but in the account preserved by Pausanias he was said to have brought his people from Aetolia to Elis where his sons ruled until Aetolus was forced to return to Aetolia because of a blood-guilt, leaving Elis to be ruled by its own eponym, Eleios. The myth thus implies a degree of identity between the Elean and Aetolian peoples and merges the rich mythical history of Aetolia with the comparatively poor mythical history of Elis (»» West 1985, 141, 173f. [Tables 1, 2], Gantz 1993, 35f., 167f., and especially Fowler 2013, 130–32). Sositheus's tragedy presumably dealt with an episode in Aethlius's mythical biography. ***F 1*** *suggests a situation in which he or a supporting character expresses confidence that, though outnumbered, he will overcome his enemies.*

F 1 Stobaeus, *Anthology,* 'Praise of boldness'

One eagle scares away ten thousand birds, and a well raised man
a host of fainthearted ones.

Notes on Sositheus

T 2

The speaker is a satyr whose statue is imagined watching over the tomb of Sositheus in the countryside outside Athens. He praises the poet for his successes, and in particular for having boldly taught him to recover his native character, unlearning the 'new habits' in which he had been trained. The satyr thus personifies satyr-drama in general, which Sositheus is said to have restored to the character it had when Pratinas of Phlious (supposedly) introduced it to Athens in the early fifth century (Vol. 1, p. 49).

This is one of seven epigrams celebrating poets (five of them dramatic) composed by Dioscorides, probably in Alexandria, towards the end of the third century BC and preserved in Book 7 of the Palatine Anthology.[4] Like those on Thespis and Aeschylus (Thespis **T 8** in Vol. 1), the epigrams on Sophocles and Sositheus are a contrasting pair, each spoken by a satyr watching over the poet's

[4] *Anth.Pal.* 7.31 Anacreon, 37 Sophocles, 407 Sappho, 410 Thespis, 411 Aeschylus, 707 Sositheus, 708 Machon. Annotated texts: Gabathuler 1937, 25–29, 79–90; Gow–Page 1965, I.86–89 (Dioscorides XVIII–XXIV), II.250–58.

tomb, and must have been adjacent in Dioscorides' original book.[5] Sophocles is credited with bringing his satyr from Phlious to Athens and turning him from his primitive rustic form into a grand figure associated with the tragic stage.[6] Sositheus on the other hand has taken his satyr back to his Phliasian roots.[7] What this 'restoration' involved can be inferred approximately from the epigram and from what we know of postclassical satyr-drama, which in a least some cases featured contemporary figures and metatheatrical elements in the manner of older comedy.[8] Sositheus's *Daphnis or Lityerses* and his Crotus-play (note 3 above) both had purely mythical subjects and bucolic settings, as was normal in classical satyr-drama. The epigram's references to the Dorian Muse's 'masculine character', 'loud declaiming' and the poet's 'audacious thinking', along with the satyr's name (Skirtos, 'Leaper') and the tomb's rustic location, suggest that Sositheus restored something of the boisterousness and crudity which had been eliminated from satyr-drama in more recent times (Cozzoli, Fantuzzi). Nervegna 2019 interprets lines 5–8 as meaning that Sositheus rejected the New Music and returned to older, more dignified traditions of music and dance. The entire tradition of the Dorian origin of Athenian satyr-drama is questioned in *SEHT* II.480–83.

1. as in the city: Sophocles was in fact buried outside the city (*Life of Sophocles* = *TrGF* 4 T 1, §15, cf. T 92–94), and Sositheus's burial place is unknown, but the epigram is designed to contrast the rustic character of Sositheus's satyr-drama with Sophocles' more urbane satyric style. **3. Skirtos**: 'Leaper' (σκαίρω, σκιρτάω 'skip, gambol'), an apt name for a satyr,[9] though also an ordinary man's name in inscriptions (4x in *LGPN*). **wore the ivy:** ivy wreaths

---

[5] On this pairing and the artificiality of these 'sepulchral' epigrams see Bing 1988, 39f.; Fantuzzi 2007a; 2007b, 487–94.

[6] *Anth.Pal.* 7.37.3–5: ὅς με τὸν ἐκ Φλιοῦντος ἔτι τρίβολον πατέοντα | πρίνινον ἐς χρύσεον σχῆμα μεθηρμόσατο | καὶ λεπτὴν ἐνέδυσεν ἁλουργίδα ('who converted me, the one from Phlious still treading the rough threshing-board, to a golden figure and clothed me in fine purple'). On the sense of this see Cozzoli 274–78, Nervegna 203–5.

[7] This elides Sositheus's tragedies, presumably because his distinctive work was in satyr-drama (cf. Cozzoli 281f.; Fantuzzi 2007a, 112 with n. 21; 2007b, 492).

[8] Contemporary figures: Python's *Agen*, Lycophron's *Menedemus*, Cleanthes in Sositheus T 4 (p. 281 with n. 2 above). Metatheatrical (parabatic) elements: Astydamas II F 4 (from his satyr-play *Heracles*: »» *GrSat* 569–73) and perhaps *TrGF* adesp. F 646a (if from a satyr-play rather than a comedy: »» *GrSat* 635–38, O'Sullivan–Collard 468–77).

[9] 'Skirtos': Nonnus, *Dionys.* 14.111; *SEG* 39, 1334 = *SGO* I, 06/02/05 (a verse inscription for a now lost statue of a dancing satyr dedicated to Dionysus and Attalus I of Pergamum in the 220s BC); *SEG* 36, 1263 (a 4th C. AD mosaic depicting a Dionysiac procession). 'Skirtoi': Cornutus, *ND* 30.5.

were worn by celebrants of Dionysus (and Demeter: Philicus **T add.** below) and by victors in dramatic contests (»» Fantuzzi 2007b, 484). **ἐκισσοφόρησε** (aorist) seems to allude to specific occasions when Sositheus won the prize. For the verb in this sense cf. *IG* II^2 3101 (= II^3 4, 507: *SEHT* II.79–81). **6. led me to recall my ancestral land:** lit. 'led me to fatherland recollection', i.e. to perform in the original Phliasian style. If this text is correct, **μνήμην πατρίδ(α)** is an innovative phrase on the lines of Homeric πατρὶς γαῖα etc. (LSJ 'πατρίς' I), and **ἀναρχαΐσας** is a unique instance of the compound verb ἀναρχαΐζω. Latte's πατρίδος ἀρχαΐσας ('led me to recollection of my fatherland (by) archaizing', considered also by Gow–Page, questioned by Cozzoli 279f.) would be more normal, but the compound **ἀναρχαΐσας**, **going *back* to the old ways** seems intentional. **πατρίδ(α)** can hardly be taken as object of **ἀναρχαΐσας** ('he brought me to recollection, bringing his/our fatherland back to its old ways' as e.g. Fraser 1972, II.851f. with earlier refs.). **7. the Dorian Muse:** a further reminder that satyr-drama in its unrefined form was Dorian (from Phlious) rather than Athenian. Scholars have compared the Δώριον χορείαν of Pratinas F 3.17 (e.g. Fortuna 1993, 246, Fantuzzi 2007a, 115). **8. drawn towards loud declaiming**: in *Od.* 4.504 Poseidon hears Ajax μεγάλ(α) . . . αὐδήσαντος. The loudness probably matches the masculinity of line 7, but the corruption of the next verse makes its precise force unclear. **9.** meaningless text: the phrases noted in the apparatus give 'the impression/form of thyrsuses in my hand pleased me . . . ' Cozzoli 280f. suggests this might have referred to a thyrsus held in the satyr-statue's hand, like the tragic mask held by Sophocles' satyr, *Anth.Pal.* 7.37.7f., but more probably the subject of lines 8–10 was 'I', the satyr who here embodies satyr-drama.

F 1

For the sentiment cf. Moschion **F 1** n. **One eagle scares away ten thousand birds etc.:** cf. Lesb.incert.auct. fr. 10 Lobel–Page/Voigt ('like birds cowering before a swift eagle . . . '), *Iliad* 15.690–3 (Hector attacks like an eagle attacking a flock of birds feeding at a riverside), *Odyssey* 22.302–6 (Odysseus and his men fall on the suitors like vultures falling on birds), Soph. *Ajax* 167–71 (Ajax's critics chatter like birds in his absence, but his mere appearance, like a vulture's, will silence them: »» Finglass *ad loc.*), Plut. *Demetrius* 28.5 (Antigonus will disrupt the coalition of his enemies like a flock of grain-eating birds: Hornblower 2019, 99). Schramm (51f.) and Scopece 1994 suggest that the fragment refers to an able orator prevailing over a less well-prepared audience. This seems unlikely to me.

LYCOPHRON OF CHALCIS
(*TrGF* 100)

Texts. TrGF 1[2].273–78 with *addenda* 1[2].356, 5.1116; *MusTr* 212–17, 296f.

Discussions. Schramm 1929, 25–40; Lowe 2013, 348–53; Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 74–90; Hornblower 2015, 39; 2019, 99–101; Carrara 2018, 116f.

Satyr-play (Menedemus). Steffen 1979, 84–87; *GrSat* 617–23; Cipolla 2003, 365–76; O'Sullivan–Collard 2013, 456–61 with bibliography.

From ***T 1–4*** *it appears that Lycophron was born c. 320–310, had a substantial career as playwright and scholar, and spent a large part of his later life working on the comic texts assembled in the Alexandrian Library (****T 6****). Besides this work Lycophron wrote at least nine books* On Comedy *whose scope is unclear but which included lexical observations on Old Comedy and were significant enough to be used by later Hellenistic scholars.*[1] *In antiquity he was generally identified as the author of the extant* Alexandra*, the Suda's 'obscure poem' in which a guard reports in 1474 cryptic iambic trimeters the captive Cassandra's prophecies of the tribulations of the Greeks resulting from the sack of Troy. Despite much modern uncertainty it seems likely that this was a different Lycophron writing in the early second century.*[2]

The now best-known work of Lycophron of Chalcis is the satyr-play Menedemus*, a mild satire on the philosopher Menedemus of Eretria, Lycophron's contemporary and fellow-Euboean, which may or may not have been intended for public performance. Some fifteen verses from a symposium scene (F 2–4) are quoted by Diogenes Laertius and Athenaeus (»» bibliography above). From the many tragedies mentioned by Tzetzes and the Suda we have only the Suda's twenty titles and the sententious verses* ***F 5*** *quoted by Stobaeus from* Pelopidae (Sons of Pelops)*, which presumably involved some stage of the conflict between Atreus*

[1] See the reassessment in Lowe 2013. Sources and bibliography in *LGGA* 'Lycophron of Chalcis' (C. Meliadò). Half of the three dozen fragments are conjecturally ascribed.

[2] See most recently Hornblower 2015, 36–41, 47–49, 114 dating the poem around 190 BC.; Lowe 348f. n. 25. For the opposing view see now Rozokoki 2019 with review by Potter 2021.

and Thyestes for the kingship of Mycenae (see further below). A number of other titles likewise suggest plays based on mainstream tragic myths, including Aeolus, Andromeda, Heracles *(madness or death),* Hippolytus, Laius, Nauplius *(see above, pp. 42f. on Astydamas II and n. 12 below),* Oedipus, Pentheus *(cf. Iophon* ***T 1(a)****,* ***F 2*** *with notes in Vol. 1, Chaeremon* ***T 1****,* ***F 4–7****),* Telegonus *(~ Sophocles'* Odysseus Acanthoplêx*: see on Astydamas II* ***F 1b****) and* Chrysippus*.*

A few titles are less familiar. **Aeolides** *is unknown as a personal name except in an unhelpful entry in Hesychius's lexicon (α 2022, Αἰολίδης· ὄνομα). It is normally an epithet for the sons and descendants of Aeolus son of Hellen (Cretheus, Sisyphus, Athamas* et al.*) and could have been applied to a son of the Aeolus associated with the Aeolian islands such as the ill-fated Macareus of Euripides'* Aeolus*. As a title it remains obscure.*[3] *A likely subject for* **Aletes** *is the Heraclid Aletes, leader of the Dorian settlement of Corinth, founder of the Aletid dynasty and subject of several legends (Strabo 8.8.5, Diodorus 7.9.2, Pausanias 2.4.3–4, 5.18.7–8, Conon,* Narratives *26, Schol. Pind.* Nem*. 7.105a [155a Drachmann], »»* RE *I.1.1369–71, 'Aletes 5'); less probably the son of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra killed by Orestes in Hyginus,* Fab*. 122 (see above under Sophocles II, and below on adesp.* ***F 3e****).* **Elephenor** *presumably concerned the former suitor of Helen ([Hesiod] fr. 204.52–55 M–W = 155.52–55 Most) who in the* Iliad *led the Abantids of Euboea at Troy and was killed there (*Il*. 2.536–45, 4.463–69). This hardly provides a basis for a tragic plot, but a different account known from lines 1034–46 of the* Alexandra *and the scholia there might have done so. Here the young Elephenor was banished from Euboea after accidentally killing his grandfather; he survived the war at Troy but could not return to Euboea and instead sailed westwards with his comrades and ultimately founded the city of Amantia (or Abantia) in Epirus. The history of Elephenor would have been of interest to the tragedian Lycophron who himself came from Euboea.*[4]

---

[3] Jahn's conjecture *Aethalides* is unhelpful since, as he admitted, no relevant mythical episode is known. Aethalides was the semi-mortal son of Hermes and herald of the Argonauts: Ap. Rhod. 1.53–55, 640–52 (»» Fowler 2013, 216 on Pherecydes F 109).

[4] Geffcken 1891, 33–37 suggested the connection between the *Alexandra*'s myth and the tragedy; he assumed a single Lycophron, but the connection is plausible anyway. See also Hornblower 2015, 377–81 on *Alex.* 1034–46.

The titles **Suppliants** *and* **Allies** *are too vague for useful identification. Likewise* **Orphanos***, usually understood as* The Orphan *but also a personal name.*[5] **Marathonians** *might have been a 'historical' tragedy about the Battle of Marathon (Welcker 1841, 1257), but several mythical episodes offer possible material*.[6] **Cassandreians***, on the other hand, must have been in some way about the people of Cassandreia in Chalci-*

T 1 Ioannes Tzetzes, Introduction to Lycophron's *Alexandra*, pp. 4–5 Scheer (= *TrGF* CAT A 5b; pp. 4.26–5.4 ~ Schol. Theocr. p. 9.15–28 Wendel)

(4.20) ἀλλαχοῦ γὰρ οὗτος ὁ Λυκόφρων τραγικός ἐστι ξδ΄ ἢ μς΄ δράματα τραγῳδιῶν γεγραφώς . . . (4.25) ὁ Λυκόφρων οὑτοσὶ τῷ μὲν γένει Χαλκιδεὺς ἦν, υἱὸς Σωκλέους ἢ Λύκου τοῦ ἱστοριογράφου κατά τινας. εἷς δὲ ἦν τῶν ἑπτὰ ποιητῶν, οἵτινες διὰ τὸ εἶναι ἑπτὰ τῆς Πλειάδος ἐλέγοντο· ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα Θεόκριτος ὁ τὰ βουκολικὰ γράψας, Ἄρατος ὁ τὰ Φαινόμενα γράψας καὶ ἕτερα, Νίκανδρος, Αἰαντίδης ἢ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ τὰ Ἀργοναυτικά, Φίλικος, Ὅμηρος ὁ νέος . . . (4.34) καὶ οὗτος ὁ Λυκόφρων κἂν ἕτεροι μὴ εἰδότες ἄλλους φασὶν εἶναι τῆς Πλειάδος. ἦσαν δὲ οὗτοι ἐν χρόνοις Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου καὶ Βερενίκης . . . (5.4) ηὐδοκίμει δὲ τότε ὁ Λυκόφρων οὐ τοσοῦτον διὰ τὴν ποίησιν ὅσον διὰ τὸ λέγειν ἀναγραμματισμοὺς οἷον ὅτι Πτολεμαῖος ἀπὸ μέλιτος λέγει μεταγραμματιζόμενον, Ἀρσινόη δὲ ἴον Ἥρας καὶ ἕτερα τοιαῦτα τούτοις ὅμοια . . .

T 2 Ioannes Tzetzes, *Historiae ('Chiliades')* 8.204.471, 474–78

Λυκόφρονες γεγόνασι διάφοροι τὴν κλῆσιν . . . 471
οὗτος ὁ παῖς τοῦ Λύκου δέ, εἴτε μὲν τοῦ Σωκλέους, 474
Λυκόφρων ὁ καὶ σύγχρονος ὑπάρχων Πτολεμαίῳ, 475
πολλὰ μὲν συνεγράψατο δράματα, τραγῳδίας,
καὶ βίβλον ἣν ἐπέγραψεν τὴν κλῆσιν Ἀλεξάνδραν,
εἰς ἣν ὁ Τζέτζης ἔγραψεν ἐξήγησιν, καὶ ἄλλας.

[5] *IG* XII.9 751, a 3rd C. BC sepulchral inscription (Φιλίππη Ὀρφανοῦ) from, as it happens, Eretria in Euboea.

[6] The story of Marathos of Arcadia, eponym of the town of Marathon, who gave his life for victory while helping the Tyndarids to retrieve the abducted Helen from Attica (Plutarch, *Theseus* 32.4: »» Ribbeck 1875, 160f.); Theseus's conquest of the Bull of Marathon, perhaps with the Hecale episode, subject of Callimachus's *Hecale* (cf. Plut. *Thes.* 14). The chorus of Euripides' *Heraclidae* were men of Marathon. Hornblower (2019, 101) notes that *Marathonians* is not quite the right name for the men who fought the battle there.

dice, the city created by Cassander of Macedon in 316 BC near the abandoned site of Poteidaia. Several possible subjects have been suggested, the most plausible being the overthrow of the archetypally vicious tyrant Apollodorus by Antigonus Gonatas (patron of Alexander of Aetolia amongst others) in 276;[7] *this would resemble the likely subject of Moschion's* Pheraeans (above, pp. 246–48).

T 1 John Tzetzes, Introduction to Lycophron's *Alexandra*

This Lycophron is otherwise a tragic poet, one who wrote 64 or 46 tragedies . . . This Lycophron was Chalcidian by birth, son of Socles, or of the historian Lycus according to some.[8] He was one of the seven poets who because of their being seven were called the poets of the Pleiad; their names were Theocritus who wrote the bucolics, Aratus who wrote the *Phaenomena* and other things, Nicander, Aeantides or Apollonius who wrote the *Argonautica*, Philicus, Homer the younger . . . *(see Homer Byz.* ***T 6****)* . . . and this Lycophron, even if others ignorantly say that others belonged to the Pleiad.[9] They lived in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus and Berenice . . . Lycophron was distinguished at that time not so much for his poetry as for making anagrams such as that Ptolemaios with its letters rearranged says *apo melitos* ('from honey') and Arsinoe *ion Hêras* ('Hera's violet'), and others of this kind . . .

T 2 John Tzetzes, 'On the Commentary on Lycophron of Chalcis'

There have been various men named Lycophron . . . This Lycophron, son of Lycus or else of Socles, the one who was contemporary with Ptolemy, composed many dramas, tragedies, and a book he inscribed with the name *Alexandra*, on which Tzetzes wrote a commentary, and others.

[7] As suggested by Niebuhr (1827, 117) and accepted e.g. by Ribbeck (1875, 159f.). One can imagine a scenario in which Antigonus responded to an appeal for liberation from the citizens of Cassandreia (the play's chorus). Other options are discussed inconclusively by Schramm 32f., Kotlińska-Toma 83, Hornblower 99f.

[8] See note 11 below.

[9] See above, pp. 270f. on the composition of the Pleiad.

T 3 Suda *λ* 827

Λυκόφρων, Χαλκιδεὺς ἀπὸ Εὐβοίας, υἱὸς Σωκλέους, θέσει δὲ Λύκου τοῦ Ῥηγίνου· γραμματικὸς καὶ ποιητὴς τραγῳδιῶν. ἔστι γοῦν εἷς τῶν ἑπτὰ οἵτινες Πλειὰς ὠνομάσθησαν. εἰσὶ δὲ αἱ τραγῳδίαι αὐτοῦ Αἰόλος, Ἀνδρομέδα, Ἀλήτης, Αἰολίδης, Ἐλεφήνωρ, Ἡρακλῆς, Ἱκέται, Ἱππόλυτος, Κασσανδρεῖς, Λάϊος, Μαραθώνιοι, Ναύπλιος, Οἰδίπους α΄, β΄, Ὀρφανός, Πενθεύς, Πελοπίδαι, Σύμμαχοι, Τηλέγονος, Χρύσιππος. διασκευὴ δ᾽ ἐστὶν ἐκ τούτων ὁ Ναύπλιος. ἔγραψε καὶ τὴν καλουμένην Ἀλεξάνδραν, τὸ σκοτεινὸν ποίημα.

T 4 Suda *λ* 814

Λύκος, ὁ καὶ Βουθήρας, Ῥηγῖνος, ἱστορικός, πατὴρ Λυκόφρονος τοῦ τραγικοῦ, ἐπὶ τῶν διαδόχων γεγονὼς καὶ ἐπιβουλευθεὶς ὑπὸ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως. οὗτος ἔγραψεν ἱστορίαν Λιβύης, καὶ περὶ Σικελίας.

T 5 Diogenes Laertius 2.133.2f. (= Antigonus of Carystus p. 97.31f. Wilamowitz)

ἠσπάζετο δὲ (*sc.* ὁ Μενέδημος) καὶ Ἄρατον καὶ Λυκόφρονα τὸν τῆς τραγῳδίας ποιητὴν καὶ τὸν Ῥόδιον Ἀνταγόραν . . .

T 6 (= Alexander **T 7**) Ioannes Tzetzes, *Prolegomena de comoedia Aristophanis*, Proem I.1–6, p. 22 Koster (~ Proem II.1–4, 22–25, pp. 31f., 33 Koster; Anon. Crameri II.1–4, 17–19, p. 43 Koster; Schol. Plaut. 1–6, p. 48 Koster)[10]

Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Αἰτωλὸς καὶ Λυκόφρων ὁ Χαλκιδεὺς μεγαλοδωρίαις βασιλικαῖς προτραπέντες Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Φιλαδέλφῳ τὰς σκηνικὰς διωρθώσαντο βίβλους, τὰς τῆς κωμῳδίας καὶ τραγῳδίας καὶ τὰς τῶν σατύρων φημί, συμπαρόντος αὐτοῖς καὶ συνανορθοῦντος καὶ τοῦ τοιούτου βιβλιοφύλακος τῆς τοσαύτης βιβλιοθήκης Ἐρατοσθένους· ὧν βίβλων τοὺς πίνακας Καλλίμαχος ἀπεγράψατο. Ἀλέξανδρος ὤρθου τὰ τραγικά, Λυκόφρων τὰ κωμικά . . .

[10] These texts are conveniently printed with English translations in Lightfoot 2009, 110–15.

T 3 Suda

Lycophron, from Chalcis in Euboea, son of Socles, but by adoption of Lycus of Rhegium;[11] literary scholar and tragic poet; he is one of the seven who were named the Pleiad. His tragedies are *Aeolus, Andromeda, Aletes, Aeolides, Elephenor, Heracles, Suppliants, Hippolytus, Cassandreians, Laius, Marathonians, Nauplius, Oedipus I, II, Orphanos, Pentheus, Sons of Pelops, Allies, Telegonus, Chrysippus.* Amongst these *Nauplius* is a reworking.[12] He wrote also the work called *Alexandra*, 'the obscure poem'.

T 4 Suda

Lycus, also known as Boutheras, from Rhegium, historian, father of Lycophron the tragic poet; lived in the time of the Successors and was plotted against by Demetrius of Phaleron. He wrote a history of Libya and on Sicily.

T 5 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers, Menedemus*

He (i.e. Menedemus) enjoyed Aratus and Lycophron the tragic poet and Antagoras of Rhodes . . . *(see Achaeus **T 6** in Vol. 1)* . . .

T 6 (= Alexander **T 7**) John Tzetzes, *Prolegomena on Aristophanes' comedy* (and other Byzantine prolegomena)

Alexander of Aetolia and Lycophron of Chalcis, induced with large donations by Ptolemy Philadelphus, corrected the dramatic texts, I mean those of comedy and tragedy and those of satyr-drama. They were accompanied and assisted in their work of correction by such a great librarian of such a great library as Eratosthenes.[13] Callimachus prepared the registers of these books. Alexander corrected the tragic texts, Lycophron the comic ones . . .

---

[11] See **T 4** and D. G. Smith in *BNJ* for what is known of the historian (*FGrH* no. 570 with some fifteen fragments). There is no particular reason to doubt the Suda's information (derived from Hesychius of Miletus) that he was Lycophron's adoptive father.

[12] Not '*Nauplius* is a reworking from these' (i.e. a pastiche using excerpts from the other plays), as supposed by Nervegna 2013, 96, Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 86, Caroli 2020, xix–xx. A διασκευή may be anything from an author's revision to a later arrangement, adaptation or 'remake' ascribed to him (»» Veyne 1989, Caroli 2020, 3–12). I see no reason to think of Lycophron's *Nauplius* (or any other tragedy) as the model for the toy-theatre enactment of the Nauplius story described by Philo of Byzantium in Heron, *Autom*. 2.22 as suggested by Kotlińska-Toma 85f., Caroli xix–xx.

[13] This would have been early in Eratosthenes's career, long before he succeeded Apollonius as Librarian.

T 7, **T 8** *probably concern the* Alexandra *poet.*

T 9 *See above, p. 270 (Choeroboscus on Hephaestion).*

F 1–1k, 4a–c, 6–9 *are play-titles from the Suda (**T 3**).*

F 2–4 *are from the satyr-play* Menedemus.

ΠΕΛΟΠΙΔΑΙ

***F 5** is unrevealing, and the myths of the descendants of Pelops are so convoluted and diverse that guessing at the content of Lycophron's play is hardly productive, but it may be worth noting that Hyginus's* Fab. *86 has the title* Pelopidae. *The summary is very brief:*

> Thyestes, son of Pelops and Hippodamia, because he had lain with Atreus's wife Aerope, was expelled by Atreus from the kingdom; but he sent Atreus's son Pleisthenes, whom he had raised as his own son, to kill Atreus. Atreus, believing him to be his brother's son, unknowingly killed his own son.

This peculiar tale is a kind of inversion of the better known story in Fab. *88, in which Atreus has unwittingly adopted Thyestes' incestuously born*

F 5 Stobaeus 4.52.4

Λυκόφρονος ἐκ Πελοπιδῶν·

> ἀλλ' ἡνίκ' ἂν μὲν ᾖ πρόσω τὸ κατθανεῖν,
> Ἅιδης ποθεῖται τοῖς δεδυστυχηκόσιν·
> ὅταν δ' ἐφέρπῃ κῦμα λοίσθιον βίου,
> τὸ ζῆν ποθοῦμεν· οὐ γὰρ ἔστ' αὐτοῦ κόρος.

T 7–9 *See opposite.*

F 1–1k, 2–4c, 6–9 *See opposite.*

SONS OF PELOPS

son Aegisthus and sends him to kill Thyestes, only to be killed himself by Aegisthus when the latter discovers that Thyestes is his true father. Scholars since Musgrave have often linked Fab. *86 with Euripides' obscure* Pleisthenes*, but it looks more like 'one of the wild contrivances of late tragedy' (Wilamowitz 1905, 132; »» Collard–Cropp 2008b, 79–81). On the other hand, it is probably unconnected with Accius's* Pelopidae*, which may have been based on two of Sophocles'* Thyestes *plays which are probably reflected in* Fab. *88 (Dangel 2002, 283f.). That leaves open the possibility (no more) that* Fab. *86 summarizes Lycophron's plot.*

F 5 Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 'On life and death'

When death is far off, those who have suffered ill fortune yearn for Hades. But when life's final wave approaches, we yearn to live; for living has no surfeit.[14]

[14] For similar paradoxes cf. Eur. *Alc.* 669–72 (the old pray for release from life till death comes near), F 816 (we claim it's better to die than live miserably, yet cling to life when miseries afflict us), F 443 (the unfortunate love life as much as the fortunate).

ALEXANDER OF AETOLIA
(*TrGF* 101)

Texts etc. TrGF 1[2].278f.; (with other poetry) Powell 1925, 121–30; Magnelli 1999; Lightfoot 2009, 99–145

Discussions. Schramm 1929, 40–42; Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 90–93; Carrara 2018, 114–16.

*The testimonia (**T 1–4**) show that Alexander came from Pleuron in Aetolia and was employed with other notable scholar-poets of the early third century both by Antigonus Gonatas at Pella and by Ptolemy Philadelphus at Alexandria. The Suda (**T 1**) singles out his work as a tragedian and member of the Pleiad, but the remnants of his other poetry are now more substantial. There are fragments of two epyllia (short narrative poems in epic style), an elegiac retelling of the story of Antheus (quoted in full by Parthenius, cf. Vol. 1, p. 154), one or two fragments of an elegiac poem named* Muses,[1] *a few other elegiac fragments and epigrams, and references to a* Phaenomena *(on astronomy), obscene poems and assorted mythological details. The only likely trace of a tragedy is **F 1**. Snell's F 2, the information that according to Alexander*

T 1 Suda *α* 1127

Ἀλέξανδρος Αἰτωλός· ἐκ πόλεως Πλευρῶνος, υἱὸς Σατύρου καὶ Στρατοκλείας, γραμματικός. οὗτος καὶ τραγῳδίας ἔγραψεν, ὡς καὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ τραγικῶν ἕνα κριθῆναι, οἵπερ ἐπεκλήθησαν ἡ Πλειάς.

T 2 Suda *α* 3745

Ἄρατος, Σολεὺς τῆς Κιλικίας . . . γεγονὼς ἐν τῇ ρκδ΄ Ὀλυμπιάδι, ὅτε ἦν Ἀντίγονος βασιλεὺς Μακεδονίας . . . ὁ Γονατᾶς κληθείς· καὶ συνῴκει τε αὐτῷ καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ ἐτελεύτησε, σύγχρονος Ἀνταγόρᾳ τῷ Ῥοδίῳ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ Αἰτωλῷ . . .

[1] Probably 'a poem about poetry', Lightfoot 102: »» Magnelli 21–23.

Daphnis taught Marsyas to play the auloi, will be from a satyr-play or non-dramatic poem.[2] *The Alexander who said that Hermione's son by Neoptolemus was named Peleus (Sosiphanes I* ***F 7****) could have been the Aetolian, but not necessarily in a tragedy.*[3]

*Alexander's other claim to fame is his work for Ptolemy Philadelphus on the tragic and satyric texts assembled in the Alexandrian Library. The Byzantine accounts of this (****T 7****) call it a* diorthôsis *or 'correction', which in this context suggests that his job was to check the library's copy of each play (or what seemed to be the best copy), identify errors and produce a clean text which would provide a basis for future study and copying.*[4] *No detail of his work survives, and it is not clear whether he produced notes explaining his decisions or any kind of exegesis. If he did, these were superseded by the work of Aristophanes of Byzantium towards the end of the third century.*

T 1 Suda

Alexander of Aetolia: from the city of Pleuron, son of Satyrus and Stratocleia, literary scholar. He also wrote tragedies, and in fact was counted as one of the seven tragedians who were named the Pleiad.

T 2 Suda

Aratus, from Soloi in Cilicia . . . living[5] in the 124th Olympiad (280/79–277/6 BC), when Antigonus . . . surnamed Gonatas was king of Macedonia. He lived with him and died at his court, contemporary with Antagoras of Rhodes and Alexander of Aetolia . . .

---

[2] Scholia on Theocritus 8, arg. b.8–10, p. 204 Wendel (following Sositheus F 1a on Sositheus's *Daphnis*) = fr. 15 Powell, 13 Magnelli, 14 Lightfoot.

[3] Fr. dub. 19 Powell, 22 Magnelli (with comm. p. 268), 22 Lightfoot. Montana in *LGGA* (next note) points out that it could have been a comment on the Euripidean text, if Alexander published comments of this kind.

[4] See especially Pfeiffer 1968, 105–7, Montana 2015, 90–94, Montanari 2015, 642f., 651–53, 661, Schironi 2018, 20 n. 64, 763, and for Alexander's work on tragic texts Carrara 2007, 250–53, Montana 2015, 101f. and in *LGGA* 'Alexander Aetolus'.

[5] γεγονώς: see above, p. 238 n. 1.

T 4 *Life of Aratus* 1, p. 8 Martin (~ *Life* 2, p. 11 = T 5; *Life* 3, p. 15 = T 3; *Life* 4, p. 19 = T 6])

γέγονε δὲ Ἀντίγονος κατὰ τὴν ρκε΄ Ὀλυμπιάδα, καθ' ὃν χρόνον ἤκμασεν ὁ Ἄρατος καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Αἰτωλός. μέμνηται δὲ τοῦ Κατόπτρου Εὐδόξου καὶ Ἀντιγόνου <καὶ> Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Αἰτωλοῦ . . . ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις ἐπιστολαῖς Ἄρατος.

T 7 *See Lycophron **T 6***

T 8 Athenaeus 15.699b

ὅτι δὲ ἦν τις περὶ αὐτοὺς δόξα παρὰ τοῖς Σικελιώταις Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Αἰτωλὸς ὁ τραγῳδοδιδάσκαλος ποιήσας ἐλεγεῖον τρόπον τοῦτον δηλοῖ . . . .

T 9 *See above, p. 270 (Choeroboscus on Hephaestion).*

T 10 = Homer of Byzantium **T 8**

ΑΣΤΡΑΓΑΛΙΣΤΑΙ

Magnelli 1999, 248f. (F 10); Spanoudakis 2005

***F 1**, a comment on the ghost Patroclus's recollection of his upbringing with Achilles in* Iliad *23, provides the title and an indication of the subject, the killing of another boy in anger over a game of dice which led to Patroclus's exile and refuge with Peleus and his family in Phthia.*[6] *The genre is not named and has been identified as possibly satyric (Schenkl 1888, cf. Powell 128) or epyllion (Wilamowitz 1924, I.167 n. 1, cf. Schramm 41). Schenkl argued that the episode resembled the young Heracles' killing of his lyre-teacher Linus and would have been treated*

F 1 Schol.^{T} *Iliad* 23.86

ἀνδροκτασίης: καταχρηστικῶς· παῖδα γὰρ ἀνεῖλεν, ὃν <οἱ> μὲν Κλεισώνυμον, οἱ δὲ Αἰανῆ, οἱ δὲ Λύσανδρον καλεῖσθαι. ἀπέκτεινε δὲ αὐτὸν παρὰ Ὀθρυονεῖ τῷ γραμματιστῇ, ὥς φησιν Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Αἰτωλὸς ἐν Ἀστραγαλισταῖς.

3 Ἀστραγαλισταῖς Meineke ἀστρολογ- schol.

— Schol.^{AD} *Iliad* 12.1: Πάτροκλος ὁ Μενοιτίου τρεφόμενος ἐν Ὀποῦντι τῆς Λοκρίδος περιέπεσεν ἀκουσίῳ πταίσματι. παῖδα γὰρ ἡλικιώτην Ἀμφιδάμαντος οὐκ ἀσήμου Κλησώνυμον, ἢ ὥσπερ τινες Αἰάνην, περὶ ἀστραγάλων ὀργισθείς, ἀπέκτεινεν. ἐπὶ τούτῳ δὲ φυγὼν εἰς Φθίαν ἀφίκετο κἀκεῖ κατὰ συγγένειαν Πηλέως Ἀχιλλεῖ συνῆν . . . ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Ἑλλανίκῳ.

[6] For the mythographic background to Homer's placing of Patroclus's family in Locris see Fowler 2013, 537–39 on Hellanicus F 145.

T 4 *Life of Aratus* 1 (~ *Lives* 2–4 = T 3, 5, 6)

Antigonus lived in the 124th Olympiad, at which time Aratus and Alexander the Aetolian were in their prime. Aratus in his own letters mentions the *Mirror* of Eudoxus and Antigonus and Alexander the Aetolian . . . .

T 7 *See Lycophron* ***T 6***

T 8 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*

That they (i.e. epic parodists) had a certain reputation in Sicily is shown by Alexander the Aetolian, the producer of tragedies, who composed an elegy on these lines . . . *(fr. 5 Powell/8 Lightfoot quoted)* . . .

T 9, T 10 *See opposite.*

DICE-PLAYERS

in a satyr-play like Achaeus's Linus *(*TrGF *20 F 26). Spanoudakis elaborates this theory,*[7] *but as Magnelli and others have noted, an accidental killing with consequences which will end with the young offender's own death is a likely subject for a tragedy.*

F 1 Scholia on *Iliad* 23

of manslaughter: a misusage, for he (i.e. Patroclus) killed a boy (i.e. not a *man*), who some (say) was called Cleisonymos, some Aianes, and some Lysandros. He killed him in the home of Othryoneus the schoolteacher, as Alexander the Aetolian says in *Dice-players*.

— Scholia on *Iliad* 12: Patroclus, son of Menoetius, while being raised in Opous in Locris, fell victim to an involuntary blunder. He killed a boy of his own age, son of a noble Amphidamas, named Clesonymos, or as some say Aianes, in anger over a game of dice. He went into exile for this and arrived in Phthia where because of his kinship with Peleus he lived with Achilles . . . . The story is in Hellanicus (F 145 Jacoby/Fowler).

---

[7] Spanoudakis suggests that Othryoneus was portrayed conventionally as a stupid schoolteacher who allowed his pupils to play with knucklebones during school time or offered knucklebones as prize for some competition which led to the quarrel; the satyrs would have been the other schoolboys (as Schenkl suggested). It is difficult to see why satyrs would be attending a Locrian school along with Patroclus and at least one other noble boy, and it seems unlikely that a satyr-play would have been cited by an *Iliad* commentator for this mythographic point.

PHILICUS OF CORCYRA
(*TrGF* 104)

Texts. TrGF 1[2].280f.

Discussions. Schramm 1929, 19–25; Fraser 1972, I.608f. with n. 407, 650–52; Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 66–74; Carrara 2018, 113f.

The name was certainly Philicus, as in a verse from his own Hymn to Demeter *(see* ***T 2****), the poem in P. Hamburg 312 (****T*** **add.***), Hephaestion and nearly all the metrical sources (****T 2****) and the scholia on Lycophron and Theocritus (Lycophron* ***T 1****). The commoner name Philiscus appears not surprisingly in a few more remote sources,* e.g. **T 1**, **T 4**.

*From the Suda (****T 1****) we learn that Philicus was a native of Corcyra, tragedian and priest of Dionysus at Alexandria in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus (r. 283–246 BC), eponym of the choriambic hexameter, one of the tragic Pleiad and author of forty-two tragedies. He is assigned to the Pleiad also by Hephaestion (****T 2****) and the Byzantine scholia which supply most of our information about it (****T 3*** *and above, pp. 270f.). Callixenus's description of the grand procession of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (****T 4****) illustrates his role as priest of Dionysus and leader of the theatrical profession at Alexandria. Protogenes' painting of 'Philiscus writer of tragedies, meditating' (Pliny,* NH *35) may have been a portrait of him rather than Philiscus of Aegina (p. 230 above; Protogenes probably lived to around 290).*

The testimonia show Philicus chiefly as a tragedian and theatre practitioner, but he was also a versatile poet. Our only certain example of his poetry is the elaborate Hymn to Demeter *mentioned by Hephaestion (****T 2****) and known more fully from an extensive papyrus text.*[1] *The*

[1] *PSI* 12.282, *SH* nos 676–680: »» Page 1941, no. 90, Latte 1954, Fraser 1972, I.650–52, Brown 1990, Furley 2009 (proposing an Alexandrian context for the Hymn's content and performance), Giuseppetti 2012, 117–26. An elegiac inscription from Cos (*IG* XII.4.2947, Paton–Hicks no. 218) commemorating a loyal slave Inachos and stating that Philiscus *(sic)* will guide Inachos and his wife (Philiscus's former nurse) to the home of the righteous in the Underworld was attributed to Philicus by Reitzenstein (1893, 218–23; cf. Schramm 20, 22f., Kotlińska-Toma 67, 71) but is rejected by Fraser (II.859 n. 407) citing Peek's

peculiar tale of Dionysus granting an ass a human voice and its subsequent rivalry with Priapus, summarized in the scholia to Germanicus's translation of Aratus's Phaenomena*, is probably from a narrative poem rather than a satyr-play.*[2] *So far as tragic poetry is concerned, we have only two possibilities, the title* Themistocles *ascribed to 'Philiscus, comic poet' in the Suda and a sententious couplet ascribed to 'Philiscus' by Stobaeus, both printed under Philiscus of Aegina in* TrGF *(89 T 5?, 89 F 1) but perhaps to be assigned to Philicus (see above, p. 230).*

*A valedictory elegy preserved incompletely in P. Hamburg 312 (**T add.** below) casts a vivid light on Philicus's personality and career.*[3] *He is addressed primarily as an initiate of Demeter (probably at Eleusis) who will enter the afterlife without anxiety and dwell in* **'***the realms of the pious', the area of the Underworld reserved for initiates and here identified with the Isles of the Blessed (lines 1–2). He will go singing and dancing in a* kômos *(3–4) as a devotee of both Dionysus and Demeter (cf. Critias(?)* ***F 2–4*** *n. in Vol. 1). His initiation has already allowed him a contented old age, free from the fear of death, like that of his ancestor Alcinous, king of the* Odyssey*'s pleasure-loving Phaeacians whose legendary island Scheria was often identified with Philicus's home island of Corcyra. His activity as a tragedian and poet of a hymn to Demeter is alluded to in the second couplet and presumably in the now damaged reference to Demodocus in line 8.*

---

dating of the inscription to the 2nd C. BC. Reitzenstein did not have all the evidence for the name Philicus.

[2] Schol. German. Arat. p. 70.15 (p. 90 Robert): »» Wilamowitz 1912, 550 n. 1, 1924, I.166 n.3, Schramm 22, Kotlińska-Toma 69, 73f.

[3] The fragment is noted in Snell's apparatus to **T 1** as possibly referring to the tragedian. The identification, supported by the date of the papyrus (mid-3rd C. BC) and the rarity of the name Philicus, is confirmed by Fraser II.859 n. 407. Dickie 1998 identified the poem's mystic elements. See further Fantuzzi 2007c, Giuseppetti 2012, 125f.

T 1 Suda *φ* 358

Φιλίσκος, Κερκυραῖος, Φιλώτου υἱός, τραγικὸς καὶ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διονύσου ἐπὶ τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου Πτολεμαίου γεγονώς. καὶ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ τὸ Φιλίσκιον μέτρον προσηγορεύθη, ἐπείπερ αὐτῷ ἐνεδαψιλεύετο. ἔστι δὲ τῆς δευτέρας τάξεως τῶν τραγικῶν, οἵτινές εἰσιν ζ΄ καὶ ἐκλήθησαν Πλειάς. αἱ δὲ τραγῳδίαι αὐτοῦ εἰσι μβ΄.

T 2 Hephaestion, *Enchiridion de metris* 9.4, pp. 30.21–31.13 Consbruch (~ Choeroboscus, Scholia on Hephaestion, p. 236 Consbruch; Trichas, *De novem metris*, p. 387 Consbruch; Caesius Bassus, *De metris*, *Gramm.Lat.* VI.263 Keil).

Φίλικος δὲ ὁ Κερκυραῖος, εἷς ὢν τῆς Πλειάδος, ἑξαμέτρῳ συνέθηκεν ὅλον ποίημα·

τῇ χθονίῃ μυστικὰ Δήμητρί τε καὶ Φερσεφόνῃ καὶ Κλυμένῳ τὰ δῶρα.

τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἀλαζονεύεται εὑρηκέναι Φίλικος λέγων,

καινογράφου συνθέσεως τῆς Φιλίκου, γραμματικοί, δῶρα φέρω πρὸς ὑμᾶς·

ψεύδεται δέ· πρὸ γὰρ αὐτοῦ Σιμμίας ὁ Ῥόδιος ἐχρήσατο ἔν τε τῷ Πελέκει . . . κἀν ταῖς Πτέρυξιν . . . , πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἄρα ὁ Φίλικος οὐχ ὡς πρῶτος εὑρηκὼς τὸ μέτρον λέγει, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς πρῶτος τούτῳ τῷ μέτρῳ τὰ ὅλα ποιήματα γράψας.

T 3 *See above, p. 270 (Choeroboscus on Hephaestion).*

T 4 Callixenus, *Περὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας*, *FGrH* 627 F 2, lines 124–128 (in Athenaeus 5.198c)

. . . καὶ πάλιν Σάτυροι, στεφάνους ἔχοντες κισσίνους χρυσοῦς, φοινικίδας περιβεβλημένοι . . . μεθ᾽ οὓς ἐπορεύετο Φιλίσκος ὁ ποιητής, ἱερεὺς ὢν Διονύσου, καὶ πάντες οἱ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνῖται.

T 1 Suda

Philiscus, Corcyrean, son of Philotas, tragedian and priest of Dionysus living in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. The Philiscian metre was named after him, because he used it extensively. He belongs to the second rank of tragedians who are 7 and were called the Pleiad. His tragedies are 42.

T 2 Hephaestion, *Handbook on Metres*

Philicus of Corcyra, one of the Pleiad, composed a whole poem in (catalectic choriambic) hexameter:

To chthonic Demeter and Persephone and to Clymenus[4] *these mystic gifts . . .*

And Philicus boasts of having invented this metre, saying,

I bring you, literary scholars,[5] *the gifts of Philicus' novel composition.*

But this is not true, for before him Simmias of Rhodes used it in the *Axe . . . fr. 25.1 quoted) . . .* and in the *Wings . . . (fr. 24.1 quoted) . . .*,[6] unless of course Philicus is talking not as having first invented the metre but having first written the whole poems in it.

T 3 *See opposite.*

T 4 Callixenus*, On Alexandria* (quoted in Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*)

. . . and again Satyrs, wearing golden ivy-crowns and crimson cloaks . . . and after them came the poet Philiscus, priest of Dionysus, and all the Artists of Dionysus.[7]

---

[4] Lit. '(In)famous', a euphemism for Hades: cf. Lasus fr. 702.1 *PMG,* Δάματρα μέλπω Κόραν τε Κλυμένοι' ἄλοχον, 'I sing Demeter and Korê, wife of Clymenus'. Philicus echoes the opening of Lasus's hymn and may have followed him in linking the Demeter-cults of Hermione and Eleusis (Giuseppetti 2012, 118 with discussion of the Eleusinian elements in Philicus's hymn, 120–24).

[5] γραμματικοί: see above, p. 272 n. 9. Here it suggests humorously that Philicus's novel hymn will be a real treat for metrical experts.

[6] These are pattern-poems in choriambic metre (*Anth.Pal.* 15.22, 24 = Simmias frs 25, 24 Powell). The verses vary in length to make the shapes of a double axe and a bird's wings. On Hellenistic poets' metrical experiments (Simmias, Philicus and others) see Kwapisz 2013, 160–63.

[7] From a description of the enormously elaborate procession (*pompê*) staged by Ptolemy II for one of his four-yearly Ptolemaia festivals in the 270s (»» Rice 1983). Dionysus and his entourage took a leading part. The Artists of Dionysus, here headed by Philicus as priest, were the guilds of theatre practitioners who

T ***add.*** P. Hamburg inv. 312 (3rd C. BC) recto col. ii, ed. Wilamowitz 1912, re-ed. Lloyd-Jones–Parsons 1983, *SH* no. 980.

ἔρχεο δὴ μακαριστὸς ὁδοιπόρος, ἔρχεο καλοὺς
χώρους εὐσεβέων ὀψόμενος, Φίλικε,
ἐκ κισσηρεφέος κεφαλῆς εὔυμνα κυλίων
ῥήματα, καὶ νήσους κώμασον εἰς μακάρων,
εὖ μὲν γῆρας ἰδὼν εὐέστιον Ἀλκινόοιο 5
Φαίηκος, ζώειν ἀνδρὸς ἐπισταμένου·
Ἀλκινόου τ̣ι̣ς̣ ἐ̣ὼ̣ν̣ ἐξ αἵματος ⟨ ⟩
[ ]ο Δ̣η̣μοδόκου

---

supplied dramatic and musical performances at festivals throughout the Hellenistic period (»» Lightfoot 2002; Le Guen 2001; 2019, 163–67; Aneziri 2003, 2009).

T *add.* Hamburg papyrus (see above, p. 301)

Go now, Philicus, a blessed traveller, go on your way to see the realms of the pious, rolling words of beautiful song from your ivy-wreathed head, and enter revelling into the Isles of the Blessed, having duly seen the happy old age of Phaeacian Alcinous, a man who knew how to live. Being one of the blood of Alcinous . . . *(end of line 7 omitted by the writer, most of 8 lost)* . . . of/from Demodocus . . . *(further lines lost)* . . .

NICOMACHUS OF ALEXANDRIA TROAS
(*TrGF* 127)

Texts. TrGF 1[2].285–87 with *addenda* 1[2].356.

Discussions. Schramm 1929, 85–87; Dihle 1936; Hoffmann 1951, 127–29; Stoessl 1970; Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 148–50.

*A tragedian Nicomachus of Alexandria Troas is identified only in the Suda (**T 1**, from Hesychius of Miletus). He presumably lived in the third century BC or later since the city of Alexandria Troas was so named by Lysimachus in 301, some years after its creation by Antigonus Monophthalmos. The Suda confusingly credits him with eleven tragedies and then lists fourteen titles as 'some of these', including at least one,* Eileithuia*, and probably another,* Metekbainousai*, which belong to the mid-third century Athenian comic poet Nicomachus.*[1] Geryon*,* Aletidês *and* Persis *could have been either tragedies or comedies,*[2] *and* Trilogia *could mean a trilogy comprising three of the tragic titles (various combinations have been proposed). Stoessl and others have noted traces of alphabetic order in the Suda's list, and it is possible to reduce it to eleven tragic titles accordingly, e.g.* Alexander, Eriphyle, Geryon, Mysians, Neoptolemus, Oedipus, Persis, Polyxena, Trilogia(?), Tyndareus, Teucer.

*The matter is further complicated by the fact that seven text-fragments included in TrGF are all ascribed by their sources simply to 'Nicomachus' and that more than one tragedian of this name is known. The Suda lists a Nicomachus of Athens (*TrGF *no. 36) who competed*

[1] See *PCG* VII.56–61. The comic Nicomachus is named in four inscriptions from Delos and Samos (T 1–4). The four text-fragments are clearly comic with the possible exception of F 4; *PCG* plausibly adds the Suda's title *Metekbainousai/Women Transiting* (from one ship/vehicle/topic/state of mind etc. to another).

[2] Ephippus (4th C.) produced a comic *Geryon*, but the subject could be tragic as in Stesichorus's *Geryoneis*; a tragic *Geryon* is mentioned in the Aristotelian *Problems* 19.48, 922b13f. Ἀλετίδης looks like a man's name but is found only here. Bernhardy suggested Ἀλετρίδες, *'Grain-grinding Women'* (therefore comic), Körte Ἀλήτης (a title of Lycophron, **T 3** with p. 289 above). Or perhaps Ἀλητίδης, one of the Alêtidai of Corinth? *Persis* might be either *Πέρσις* (as transmitted) = *Sack (of Troy*?) or *Περσίς* = *The Persian Woman* (title of a comedy by Nausicrates, 4th C.).

against Euripides and Theognis in the late fifth century and composed an Oedipus *(see below with* ***T 1****)*.[3] *A didascalic record shows probably a third tragic Nicomachus competing at the Lenaea of 364*.[4] *Ascription of the seven text-fragments to Nicomachus of Alexandria Troas seems natural at first sight since the titles* Alexander *and* Oedipus *appear both in the lexicographic tradition and in the Suda's list, but these are not unusual titles and it seems unlikely that the lexicographers would have drawn on a Hellenistic tragedian rather than an Athenian contemporary of Euripides; the later one would be the only Hellenistic tragedian represented in the lexicographic tradition, unless we count Lycophron's* Alexandra*. Alpers preferred to assign the* Oedipus *fragment (****F 7****) to the fifth-century Nicomachus.*[5] *The other fragments all involve words beginning with the letter α and appear only in the* Synagôgê *(****F 13, 14****) and Photius's* Lexicon *(all six);*[6] *they presumably had a single lexicographic source which will have drawn them from a single Nicomachus. It seems rather likely that this was the fifth-century Athenian.*[7] *If so,* Alexander *with* ***F 1*** *would be his as well, and perhaps some of the other tragic titles listed in* ***T 1***.[8]

For Mysians *see also p. 398 below (Hyginus,* Fab. *100)*.

---

[3] Cf. Vol. 1, xv n. 27, xix–xx n. 46, Hoffmann 1951, 127–29. The Suda presumably reflects a didascalic record of a single contest at the Dionysia in which Nicomachus came first, Euripides second and Theognis third. The 'surprise' does not imply any direct knowledge of Nicomachus's plays (cf. Philocles I **T 3**, Xenocles II **T 3** with notes, Vol. 1). This Nicomachus may or may not be the one who won the actors' prize at the Dionysia in about 448 (*IG* II^2 2325.23) and/or the actor named in Schol. Ar. *Frogs* 1506c (for both see Stephanis no. 1850).

[4] *SEG* XXVI, 203 col. II.3f., [Νι]κόμαχος [τρί:] | Ἀμυμώνηι Τ[(= *TrGF* I^2 *addenda* pp. 341f.; Millis–Olson 2012, 121). It seems unlikely that this is the rival of Euripides and Theognis competing at a lesser festival nearly fifty years later (cf. Webster 1972, 739, *TrGF* 1^2.349 *addenda* to p. 155; Millis–Olson 2012, 121 find it possible).

[5] Alpers 1981, 238 commenting on Orus's *Lexicon* fr. B 107 (cf. n. 9 below).

[6] **F 16**, the form ἀνηλέητος as an alternative to ἀνηλεής, probably derives from the Atticist Phrynichus (*Praep.Soph.epit.* p. 46.2, 'ἀνηλέητος καὶ ἀνηλεής').

[7] Webster (1972, 739f.) and Herington (1973, 463) suggested that the metres of **F 1** (lyric iambic) and **F 7** and **F 13** (anapaests) favour the fifth-century poet (**F 1,** *ia/cr/ba* with the unique compound ἀμβλυδερκές is reminiscent of Aechylus), but the lack of relevant data for the third century makes this uncertain.

[8] Stoessl (1970) similarly favours assigning all the text-fragments and (at least) the titles *Alexander* and *Oedipus* to Nicomachus of Athens.

T 1 Suda *ν* 396

Νικόμαχος, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῆς Τρωϊκῆς, τραγικός, γράψας τραγῳδίας ια΄, ὧν καὶ αἵδε· Ἀλέξανδρος, Ἐριφύλη, Γηρυόνης, Ἀλετίδης, Εἰλείθυια, Νεοπτόλεμος, Μυσοί, Οἰδίπους, Πέρσις, Πολυξένη, Τριλογία, Μετεκβαίνουσαι, Τυνδάρεως ἢ Ἀλκμαίων, Τεῦκρος.

2 Ἀλετρίδες Bernhardy Ἀλήτης Körte 3 ἢ del. Bernhardy

— Suda *ν* 397: Νικόμαχος, Ἀθηναῖος, τραγικός· ὃς παραδόξως Εὐριπίδην καὶ Θέογνιν ἐνίκησε. τῶν δραμάτων ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ Οἰδίπους.

ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ

F 1 Photius *α* 1166 Theodoridis

ἀμβλυδερκές· Νικόμαχος Ἀλεξάνδρῳ·

Διὸς γὰρ οὐκ ἀμβλυδερκὲς ὄμμα.

ΟΙΔΙΠΟΥΣ

F 7 Orus, *Orthography* (‘Lexicon Messanense’ ed. Rabe 1892, fol. 281r. 16f.)

νικῴη σὺν τῷ ι, Νικόμαχος Οἰδίποδι·

ὅτι μὲν λῷστον, τόδε νικῴη.

INCERTAE FABULAE

F 13 *Synagoge*^{B} *α* 429 Cunningham (= Photius *α* 444 Theodoridis)

ἀηδόνειος κλαγγή· Νικόμαχος·

μέλπουσί τ’ ἀηδόνιον

κλαγγήν

μέλπουσί τ’ Wilamowitz -σιν *Synagog.* -σι τὴν Phot. ἀηδόνιον Meineke -ειον *Synagog.*, Phot.

F 16a Photius *α* 3167 Theodoridis

αὔθαιμος· Νικόμαχος·

εἰς σίδηρον ᾔξεν αὔθαιμος σπορά.

F 2–6, **8–12** *are play-titles from the Suda (**T 1**).*

Brief fragments: **F 14** ἀγηλατῶν, **F 15** αἱμόφυρτα, **F 16** δαίμων ἀνηλέητος

T 1 Suda

Nicomachus, of Alexandria in the Troad, tragedian, wrote 11 tragedies, of which some are: *Alexander, Eriphyle, Geryon, Aletidês, Eileithuia, Neoptolemus, Mysians, Oedipus, Persis, Polyxena, Trilogia, Metekbainousai (Women Transiting), Tyndareus or Alcmeon, Teucer.*

— Suda, next entry: Nicomachus, Athenian, tragedian, who surprisingly defeated Euripides and Theognis. Amongst his plays is *Oedipus*.

ALEXANDER

F 1 Photius, *Lexicon*

Nicomachus in *Alexander*:

The eye of Zeus is not dull-sighted.

OEDIPUS

F 7 Orus, *Orthography*

νικῴη with the iota, Nicomachus in *Oedipus*:

That which is best, may it prevail.[9]

UNIDENTIFIED PLAYS

F 13 Anon. *Collection of Useful Words* (and Photius's *Lexicon*)

Nightingale-cry: Nicomachus:

And they sing the nightingale-cry.[10]

F 16a Photius, *Lexicon*

αὔθαιμος: Nicomachus:

Fraternal seed rushed to arms.[11]

F 2–6, **8–12** *See opposite.*

Brief fragments: **F 14** driving out, **F 15** bloodsoaked, **F 16** a pitiless daimon

---

[9] A recasting of the chorus's words at Aesch. *Ag.* 121, 139, 159 τὸ δ' εὖ νικάτω. Orus was probably discussing the alternative optative forms νικῴη and νικῷ (Alpers 1981, p. 238, fr. B 107).

[10] A cry of grief as in Aesch F 291, Ar. *Frogs* 684 (both anapaestic, hence Meineke's adjustment of the text here). Procne became a nightingale mourning her son Itys after killing him and feeding his flesh to her husband Tereus to avenge his rape and mutilation of her sister Philomela.

[11] i.e. two brothers met in combat. The fatal combat of Oedipus's sons Eteocles and Polynices is an obvious example.

EZECHIEL
(*TrGF* 128)

Texts etc. (cited below by editor's name only). TrGF 1[2].288–301 with *addenda* 1[2].357, 5.1114, 1116; *MusTr* 216–35, 298–300; Dübner 1846; Kuiper 1900; Wieneke 1931; Jacobson 1983; Vogt 1983; Robertson 1985; Holladay 1989, 301–529; Lanfranchi 2006. *(Eusebius)* Gifford 1903; Mras 1954–56.

Jewish Greek literature of the Hellenistic period. See p. 311 n. 4.

Discussions. Kuiper 1900, 1904; Girardi 1902; Kappelmacher 1924–25; Trencsényi-Waldapfel 1952; Zwierlein 1966, 138–46; Strugnell 1967; Kraus 1968; Snell 1971, 170–93; van der Horst 1984; Sutton 1987; Vogt 1994; Fountoulakis 1995–96 and 2017, 99–107; Xanthakis-Karamanos 2001; Whitmarsh 2013; Kotlínska-Toma 2015, 199–233; Keddie–MacLellan 2017; Lanfranchi 2018; Stewart 2018; Adams 2020, 45–54.

Bibliographies. Lehnardt 1999, 365–67; DiTommaso 2001, 1035–41.

The Exagôgê *is the only pre-Christian tragedy on a biblical subject to which we can put a name.*[1] *It is also by far the fullest example of a tragedy from the Hellenistic period, albeit an untypical one. Seventeen excerpts are preserved in Book 9 of Eusebius's* Preparation for the Gospel*, the first part of an introduction to Christianity compiled between 313 and 320 AD. The* Preparation *was designed to prove the superiority of Christianity to pagan religions and especially to show that Greek philosophy and theology were anticipated by and inferior to the Jewish scriptures which underlay Christianity. It consists largely of quotations drawn from a range of earlier writings in Greek. Book 9 addresses Jewish history down to the Babylonian captivity and in chapters 17–37*

[1] 'The Damascene' (ὁ Δαμασκηνός) who composed a tragedy *Susanna* according to Eustathius on Dionysius Periegetes 976 was (of course) John of Damascus (675/6–749 AD), not the historian Nicolaus of Damascus as in *TrGF* 1[2].311 (cf. 357f.). Eustathius himself describes the work and identifies its author in his *Exegesis in canonem iambicum pentecostalem*, Proem 1.79–95 (*PG* vol. 136, p. 508), calling it a drama in Euripidean style, summarizing the prologue and adding a quotation (the latest of all tragic fragments), ὁ ἀρχέκακος δράκων | πάλιν πλανᾶν ἔσπευδε τὴν Εὔαν ἐμέ: ('the serpent, source of all evil, urged me, another Eve, again to err'). See now Cesaretti–Ronchey 2014, 11f., 132f., 135f., 141f.

reproduces excerpts on Jewish leaders from Abraham to Solomon from a work On the Jews *compiled in the mid-first century BC by Alexander of Miletus (*FGrH *273), nicknamed Polyhistor for his prolific research. Alexander gathered his information from Jewish authors writing in Greek in the Hellenistic period. The excerpts on Moses (*PE *9.26–29) are from the prose authors Eupolemus, Artapanus and Demetrius (*FGrH *723, 726, 722) and from 'Ezechiel the composer of the tragedies' (*PE *9.28.1, later 'Ezechiel in the tragedy', 'Ezechiel in the Exagôgê', 9.29.3 etc.).*[2] *A little more than a century before Eusebius, Clement of Alexandria had quoted lines 7–40 and 50–54 of the Exagôgê, probably also from Alexander, in a sketch of Moses' early life which introduces his account of Moses as a lawgiver superior to Plato (*Stromata *1.23ff.); Clement ascribes the verses to 'Ezechiel, the composer of the Jewish tragedies in the play entitled* Exagôgê'. *A century or more after Eusebius, Ezechiel's description of the phoenix (*Exag. *253–69) is quoted inaccurately and without attribution, no doubt from Eusebius, in a commentary on the Hexaëmeron (the six days of creation in the book* Genesis*) which at some point was mistakenly ascribed to the early 4th-century bishop Eustathius of Antioch; here the phoenix is described as one of the birds created by God during the fifth day of creation.*[3]

Our knowledge of the Exagôgê *thus derives entirely from Alexander's excerpts, which served to supplement the information about Moses given by his prose sources (mainly Artapanus), and from his accompanying comments. His work was designed to introduce Roman readers to Jewish history and culture, and his selection was determined by his interests and those of his readers, which tended towards the distinctive and exotic.*[4] *It is possible but not very likely that Eusebius omitted some of Alexander's excerpts (the parts of Alexander's text that he omitted*

[2] Alexander also refers to the Septuagint text of the Old Testament ('the sacred book(s)') without quoting it.

[3] For a fuller account of the sources see Lanfranchi 72–99.

[4] On the nature of Alexander's work see Lanfranchi 77–81 and 2018, 130f. For texts of Jewish Greek literature in the Hellenistic period including those quoted by Alexander see e.g. Holladay 1983, 1989, Charlesworth 1985 and the multivolume *Jüdische Schriften aus der hellenistisch-römischer Zeit (JSHRZ).* Surveys e.g. Fraser 1972, I.687–716, Walter 1990, Barclay 1996, 125–229, J. Collins 2000, Oegema 2002, Adams 2020.

before lines 32ff., 192ff., 175ff. and 242ff. were not quotations from the tragedy).

Exagôgê (The Leading Out) *is an alternative term for the Exodus (»» Lanfranchi 7), the departure of the Israelites from Egypt under the guidance of God and his chosen instrument Moses. Ezechiel's play is based mainly on the Septuagint translation of* Exodus *1–14 and 16.1, with many verbal reminiscences but also many adjustments, some adapting the biblical narrative for dramatic purposes, some nuancing it in various ways, and some adding entirely new material.*[5] *The seventeen excerpts represent eight distinct scenes:*[6]

(1) a prologue speech in which Moses recounts the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt and his birth and early life (frs 1–2 = lines 1–58, adapted from *Exodus* 1.1–2.15); this leads to:
(2) Moses' meeting with Sepphora and her sisters (frs 3–4 = 59–65 *plus* Alexander's mention of 'the watering of the livestock', i.e. Moses' defence of the sisters from the shepherds harassing them at the well which led to his marriage with Sepphora: cf. *Exodus* 2.16–21);
(3) Sepphora tells Choum about her marriage to Moses (fr. 5 = 66–67, with no biblical precedent);
(4) Moses relates a dream to his father-in-law Raguel, who interprets it as portending his future greatness (frs 6–7 = 68–89, again with no biblical precedent);
(5) God appears to Moses in the burning bush, telling him that he must return and lead the Israelites out of Egypt, promising that Aaron will assist him in addressing the Israelites and the Pharaoh, and providing him with miraculous powers (frs 8–12 = 90–131 with some unquoted 'further dialogue' between frs 9 and 10: all adapted from *Exodus* 3.1–4.17). God next tells Moses of the plagues he will inflict on Egypt to compel the Israelites' release and gives instructions for the first Passover and its future celebration (fr. 13 = 132–174, condensed from the detailed narrative of the plagues etc. in *Exodus* 7.14–13.16);
(6) God's instructions for the Passover are repeated, probably by Moses to the Israelites (fr. 14 = 175–192);
(7) a messenger reports the destruction of the Egyptian army at the Red Sea (fr. 15 = 193–242, adapted from *Exodus* 14.9–31);

---

[5] See especially the notes below introducing each section.

[6] J. J. Scaliger's tentative attribution to Ezechiel of the ten verses on the serpent as cause of all evils quoted in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 64.29 is refuted by Jacobson 1981b; cf. Holladay 404f. ('Fragment 18'), 526–29; Lanfranchi 308–10.

(8) an observer describes an oasis which the Israelites have reached after the Red Sea crossing (fr. 16 = 243–253, elaborating *Exodus* 15.27 where the oasis is named Elim) and the sighting of an extraordinary bird which is recognizable as the phoenix (fr. 17 = 254–269, with no biblical precedent).

This selection gives us a good idea of the scope of the play. We have its beginning, and the scene at the oasis probably provided a kind of coda after the climax of the Israelites' deliverance, anticipating their future prosperity (below, p. 365); their Exodus from Egypt is complete at this point. Kuiper (270) suggested that the play extended to Moses' reunion with Raguel and Sepphora as in Exodus *18; Raguel might then have seen his interpretation of Moses' dream confirmed and even interpreted the appearance of the phoenix. But this implies a radical departure from the* Exodus *narrative where the reunion happens after the Israelites have been wandering in the wilderness for several weeks, living on quails and manna and fighting the Amalekites.*[7]

If the scope of the play is reasonably clear, our understanding of its dramatic design is limited. Its diction is recognizably tragic (below, pp. 319f.) and it uses some conventional tragic components (prologue, formal dialogue, messenger speech), but how closely it adhered to a conventional tragic form is unclear, especially as we do not know what other scenes it might have contained. The main problems for reconstruction are interrelated:

Dramatic action. Between the burning bush scene and the report of events at the Red Sea we have only the repetition of the Passover instructions (fr. 14) which perhaps happened shortly before the Passover night itself (175–192 n.). How Ezechiel handled the biblical narrative of Moses' return to Egypt, his meetings with Aaron and the Israelites, his negotiations with the Pharaoh, the plagues, the events of the Passover night, the Israelites' departure and the Pharaoh's decision to pursue them (i.e. most of *Exodus* 4.18–

[7] A reunion scene is favoured by Girardi 37, Kappelmacher 81f., Wieneke 108f., Stewart 2018, 250; rejected by Trencsényi-Waldapfel 150–57, Jacobson 165, Vogt 1994, 155. Jacobson 164 also rejects a suggestion that the play included the revelation of God's law to Moses on Mount Sinai. Trencsényi-Waldapfel maintained that the final scene was set at Marah and included the events of *Exodus* 15.23–26 where Moses sweetens the bitter water with Yahweh's aid and conveys to the Israelites Yahweh's promise of protection so long as they follow his laws; it would then have ended with the Israelites' departure towards Elim. But lines 245f. make it clear that they are already approaching the oasis.

14.8) is all unknown, except that some elements are anticipated in (5)–(6) above.

Time. The relevant part of *Exodus* covers a period of about two years, including Sepphora's bearing a son to Moses, the return to Egypt, the negotiations, plagues and Passover night and the Israelites' journeys to the Red Sea and from there to Elim. Ezechiel could have abridged Moses' stay in 'Libya', and the foreshortening of time for journeys and remote events is not unusual in conventional Greek tragedies (most strikingly in Aeschylus's *Eumenides* and Euripides' *Stheneboea*).[8] Even so, a series of major time-lapses is difficult to reconcile with the conventions of earlier tragedy as we know it.

Locations. The play seems to require at least three dramatic locales (for the early scenes, the messenger's report and the final scene) or more if shifts of focus within these locales (e.g. between the well, Raguel's dwelling and the burning bush) were not finessed. Again there are precedents for such changes,[9] but in those cases the play's chorus also moves from place to place and provides some dramatic coherence. That seems impossible in the *Exagôgê*, at least if we assume that the messenger reported to an Egyptian audience.[10] This in turn leads to a further question:

Chorus. Did the play have a chorus, and if it did was the chorus dramatically integrated or did it merely provide occasional interludes? A chorus is not evident in any of Alexander's excerpts (except possibly in Moses' announcement of the arrival of Sepphora and her sisters, line 59), but that is not very significant since Alexander was not concerned with the play as a drama. It is impossible to say what convention, if any, Ezechiel might or might not have followed so far as the use of a chorus was concerned.[11]

---

[8] It is easily overlooked that in *Eumenides* Orestes wanders the earth for at least a year, possibly several years, before reaching Athens (*Eum.* 74ff., 280ff.). In the lost *Stheneboea* Bellerophon travelled from Tiryns to Lycia on his winged horse Pegasus, killed the Chimaera and other monsters, returned to Tiryns, abducted Stheneboea, threw her from Pegasus's back into the sea and returned to Tiryns again to justify himself.

[9] From Delphi to Athens in Aeschylus's *Eumenides*, and between several places in Sicily in his *Women of Aetna* (P. Oxy. 2257, *TrGF* 3.126f.).

[10] The place would presumably be the city of Ramesses where the Israelites were enslaved and from which the Exodus and the Pharaoh's pursuit began (*Exodus* 1.11, 12.37). This would also be the site of Moses' address to the Israelites and his confrontation(s) with the Pharaoh if these were enacted in the play.

[11] See below, pp. 315f. with nn. 13–14, 343, and pp. xv–xvii above on the general question of choruses in postclassical tragedy.

Any reconstruction of the play is therefore unavoidably speculative. Kuiper (265–70) envisaged a conventional plot in Euripidean style with all the scenes set near Raguel's home in Arabia. This is implausible in many ways. Kuiper had to maintain that Ezechiel could not distinguish between 'Libya' (the standard term for the African continent) with its population of 'Ethiopians' (lines 60–62) and Arabia (Kuiper 277; 1904, 87–92); that Moses met Sepphora and God at the same place even though God tells Moses that the place of their meeting is holy ground (line 98); that the Egyptian survivor who delivers the messenger speech has managed to cross the Red Sea into Arabia and reach Raguel's home before the Israelites; and that Ezechiel placed the oasis near Raguel's home even though the area is obviously new to Moses (lines 243f.). The idea of a conventional tragic plot has been tentatively revived by Stewart (2018), who defines the play as 'a 'travel tragedy' in which an exiled hero is despatched by a god to found a new polity and a new cult' (Stewart 232). Stewart rightly locates Raguel's home in Africa and argues that all of the play except its final scene could have been enacted there with time-lapses foreshortened in conventional tragic fashion and shifts of focus within this locale managed by alternations between orchestra and stage. This hypothesis also presents difficulties, however: the burning bush must appear 'in roughly the same area as Moses' first meeting with Sepphora' (Stewart 239); Moses must repeat the Passover instructions (fr. 14) to Aaron and a few companions at Raguel's house directly after his meeting with God (Stewart 246f.); the Egyptian must (again) report to Raguel and the chorus ('It is not inconceivable . . . that a lost survivor from Pharaoh's army could have stumbled upon the house of the Ethiopian king', Stewart 247);[12] *and the final scene can only be linked with the rest if Raguel and the chorus trek from their home in 'Libya' to the oasis in Arabia in the same time that it takes for the Israelites to reach the oasis from the Red Sea (one wonders why Ezechiel would have added this single detached scene to a play with an otherwise unified locale).*

Most reconstructions have assumed that the Exagôgê *did not have a classical tragic form and involved several locations and at most a more*

[12] Stewart compares the unexpected arrivals of Aegeus at Eur. *Med.* 663, Orestes at Eur. *Andr.* 881, the Corinthian at Soph. *OT* 924 and Teucer at Eur. *Hel.* 68, but the first three of these arrive with a purpose and Teucer does not function as a messenger. (Raguel is not a king, incidentally: below, pp. 344f.).

or less detached chorus (or choruses) providing interludes between the scenes.[13] *Such reconstructions posit either three locations (early scenes, messenger's report, oasis, e.g. Kappelmacher) or four (the burning bush separate, e.g. Jacobson) or five (Raguel's house additionally separate from the well, e.g. Snell, Vogt). These however do not allow sufficiently for the repetition of the Passover instructions (see 175–192 n.), and most do not allow for anything else that might have been enacted between the burning bush scene and the messenger scene.*[14] *The same can be said of the widespread assumption that the play was structured in five acts with an empty stage and choral interludes separating the acts, e.g.:*[15]

Act 1: (i) Prologue, (ii) Moses and Sepphora;
Act 2: (i) Sepphora, Choum and Moses, (ii) Moses and Raguel;
Act 3: (i) Moses and God, (ii) Passover instructions repeated;
Act 4: the messenger's report;
Act 5: arrival at the oasis.

Such a structure would supposedly conform with the practice of Hellenistic tragedy, but it is not at all clear that the five-act convention was established for tragedy in the Hellenistic period, or if it was that it was so firmly established that Ezechiel (composing what was

---

[13] A chorus consisting of Sepphora's sisters might be implied by line 59 ('I see seven maidens here'), but not necessarily since the sisters are an essential part of the narrative which Ezechiel was reproducing at this point. If there was a dramatically relevant chorus, it must have been absent for some scenes (cf. Kappelmacher 83) or itinerant (Stewart 2018) or multiple (Jacobson 32f. suggested a chorus of Egyptian magicians for the Egyptian scenes). A detached chorus, if any, seems more likely (e.g. Vogt 1994, 156, Lanfranchi 28f.). Girardi 29 and Wieneke 30 ruled out a chorus altogether. The uncertainties are generally agreed.

[14] Jacobson 34–36 is an exception, positing a conference of Moses and Aaron with the Israelite elders in Egypt including fr. 14, Moses confronting the Pharaoh and activating the plagues sequentially (perhaps before a chorus of Egyptian magicians as in *Exodus* 7), and the Pharaoh finally releasing the Israelites and then deciding to pursue them, as well as Moses' earlier confrontation with the shepherds and a reunion of Moses with Aaron shortly after the burning bush scene: 'a monster of a tragedy' (Stewart 2018, 244).

[15] See for example Kappelmacher 76–83, Wieneke 30, 60f. etc., Trencsényi-Waldapfel 149–56, Sifakis 1967, 122f., 135, Kraus 1968, 171, Snell 1971, 172–75, Taplin 1977b, 49 n. 2, Jacobson 28f., Robertson 805, Vogt 1994, 155. The idea that the *Exagôgê* was a tetralogy (Kohn 2003) is refuted by Jacobson 2003.

clearly an unconventional kind of tragedy) would have felt bound by it.[16] *A five-act play including multiple leaps of time and place is quite different from anything found in the concentrated plots of Menander or Seneca which are our main examples of this scheme. It seems unlikely that Ezechiel would have tried to cram the material of the biblical narrative into a predetermined structure rather than fitting the structure to the narrative.*

These uncertainties are due partly to the fact that we know so little about Ezechiel, his environment and his purposes in composing the play. He is known only from the descriptions of Alexander ('the composer of the tragedies') and Clement ('the composer of the Jewish tragedies') which suggest that he produced a number of tragedies on biblical themes. This is not unlikely; Jewish history provided plenty of material, and a poet as accomplished as Ezechiel would hardly have limited himself to one play. He must have been active between the publication of the Septuagint translation around the middle of the third century BC and the composition of Alexander's On the Jews *around the middle of the first, but this range cannot be narrowed with much confidence;*[17] *perhaps the best guess is the second quarter of the second century when the Jews were well established in Egypt and favoured under Ptolemy VI Philometor. This is to assume, as most scholars now do, that Ezechiel and most other Jews writing in Greek in this period lived in Egypt, most probably in Alexandria, and were primarily Greek-speaking.*[18] *The*

---

[16] The five-act structure is famously prescribed for tragedy by Horace, *Ars Poetica* 189f. (*neue minor neu sit quinto productior actu | fabula quae posci uolt et spectanda reponi*, 'a play that wants to be demanded and presented again on the stage should be neither shorter nor longer than the fifth act') and is evident in the comedies of Menander and the tragedies of Seneca, but whether or to what extent it was the rule in Hellenistic tragedy (of which the *Exagôge* is our only substantial example) is unknown. On this issue in general see e.g. Brink 1971, 248–50; Tarrant 1978, 218–21. For the *Exagôgê* see the sceptical discussion of Lanfranchi 25–32.

[17] Jacobson 6 lists suggestions varying between 250 and 40 BC, not to mention those based on the mistaken assumption that Ezechiel wrote in the Christian era and that Eusebius knew his text directly rather than from Alexander.

[18] e.g. Kraus 1968, 172–75, Fraser 1972, I.707f., Snell 1971, 171f., Jacobson 5–13, Gruen 2002, 69, Lanfranchi 11–13 (~ 2018, 126f.); cf. Girardi 20f. Alexandria was both a centre of Greek literary and theatrical culture and the home of a flourishing and substantially Hellenized Jewish population open to dramatiz-

excerpts themselves show that he had an advanced Greek education and a thorough knowledge of the literature that was central to it, with frequent use of tragic language, dramatic forms and themes.[19] *It is also obvious that the text of* Exodus *on which he based his play was the Greek text of the Septuagint, and doubtful whether he read Hebrew at all (»» Jacobson 40–47). Whether the play was meant for performance or only for reading and recitation has been much debated.*[20] *The fullest argument against a performance text was made by Zwierlein, who pointed to the play's disregard of the unities of place and time and its lack of tragic focus and dynamism,*[21] *but these points show only that this was not a conventional Greek tragedy and perhaps underestimate features of the text which were typically used to highlight or explain what was seen (or supposed to be seen) on a stage.*[22] *Performance and reading are of course not mutually exclusive. Any serious dramatic poet would have expected to put the text of his work into circulation, and Ezechiel evidently did so since he was remembered as a tragic poet and the text of at least one of his plays was known to Alexander Polyhistor some decades after its composition. The literary character of the work suggests that Ezechiel expected it to be read by educated Greeks as well as by Jews with a Hellenic education.*

If the play was originally composed for performance, it is unlikely that this would have been in a conventional Greek theatre. As Lanfranchi points out, a conscientious Jew would hardly have offered a play based on a sacred text and including the voice of God at a pagan

---

ations of biblical texts in Greek. Whitmarsh 2013, 213–15 compares the book known as *Ecclesiasticus*, a Greek translation of the Hebrew *Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach* made for Egyptian Jews who could not read the original by an immigrant from Palestine, c. 130 BC.

[19] See throughout the notes below and Wieneke's and Lanfranchi's commentaries; also Jacobson 23–28 and 1981a, 176–78, Vogt 1994, 157–60, Xanthakis-Karamanos 2001.

[20] »» Jacobson 1981a, 167–75, Lanfranchi 35–39 and 2018, 142f.

[21] Zwierlein 1966, 138–46 (cf. Girardi 30f., 38). Zwierlein exaggerated the difficulty of staging the burning bush scene (see below on 90–174, 120–31).

[22] 59 'I see seven maidens here', throughout the burning bush scene (90–174 n., 120–31 n.), and in the scout's description (243–45, 'right next to this valley etc.'). The deictics 'this', 'there' etc. are a common symptom. Such features could of course have been imitated in a text composed for reading.

religious festival, nor would it have been acceptable there.[23] *The play, then, does not provide evidence for ordinary theatre practice in the Hellenistic period. Some features of the text suggest a primarily Jewish audience: a presumption of familiarity with the Biblical context and the Exodus narrative, and detailed attention to the Passover regulations, their aetiologies and the role of the festival in commemorating the Exodus. Lanfranchi reasonably suggests that such a play might have been performed in a small theatre or* ad hoc *space in connection with a Jewish festival, perhaps the Passover itself.*[24] *The audience might still have included interested Greek-speaking pagans, as the annual celebration of the Septuagint translation on the island of Pharos did according to Philo.*[25] *It may have been partly with them in mind (whether as audience or readers) that the text skirts the more ambivalent features of Moses and the Israelites seen in the* Exodus *narrative (see notes on 130, 161–66, 193–242, 243–269) and dwells on the recognition of the special destiny of the Jewish people in Moses' dream, God's discourse to Moses, the messenger-speech (see on 238–41) and the appearance of the phoenix.*[26]

Ezechiel wrote in a conventional but rather pedestrian and heavily paratactic tragic style, often repeating or adapting the language of his classical models, especially Euripides.[27] *Several excerpts follow the*

---

[23] Bloch 2017 surveys the substantial evidence for Jewish interest in and ambivalent attitudes to pagan theatre in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, including the *Exagôgê* (but not addressing the question of where it might have been performed).

[24] Bryant Davies 2008 suggests that the text was designed to be recited in synagogues as a substitute for the Passover sacrifice (which was performed only in Jerusalem), but her explanation of why such a text should have taken the form of a Greek tragedy (the genre's high status, its ritual and aetiological elements) is unpersuasive.

[25] Philo, *Life of Moses* 2.41. On the question of audience and performance context see Lanfranchi 57–72 (cf. Lanfranchi 2018, 142–46); previously Wieneke 120, Kraus 1968, 172–75, Jacobson 17–20 with notes 1–3, Vogt 1994, 157.

[26] For recent discussions of the play in its political and cultural context see Whitmarsh 2013, Keddie–MacLellan 2017.

[27] Some examples of Euripidean and other tragic and epic language in the notes below. They are more fully treated in the commentaries of Wieneke and Lanfranchi. Kuiper 1904, 77–79 compiled a long list of Euripidean parallels, not all particularly significant.

Exodus *narrative closely, converting its language into tragic terms (the prologue speech, Moses' dialogue with God, the Passover instructions), while others adapt it more freely (the description of the plagues, the messenger's report, the oasis). The style is heightened in rhetorical set pieces (the plagues, the messenger's report, the oasis, the phoenix). There are a few syntactical liberties (9–11, 133f., 168f., 180–82, 207–9, 220f.) and some monotonous repetitions (e.g. ταχύ or τάχος 'promptly' seven times at line-end). Several words are known uniquely from this text and may be Ezechiel's inventions (or rather adaptations).*[28] *A few poeticisms are used a little inappropriately,*[29] *and a few usages are more typical of Hellenistic than earlier Greek.*[30] *The iambic metre is handled flexibly in the manner of late Euripides, with an overall resolution rate (36 per 100 lines) like those of* Helen *(36%) and* Phoenissae *(35%) and very different from the rarity of resolutions in the fragments of Moschion*

ΕΞΑΓΩΓΗ

Alexander Polyhistor quoted by Eusebius, *Praep. Evangel.* 9.28, 9.29.4–16 (cf. *FGrH* 273 F 19a); 7–40 βασιλικῶν, 50 τί–54 Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1.23.155–56 (whence P. Oxy. 83.5348, 3rd–4th C. A.D.); 256–69 inaccurately and unattributed, [Eustathius of Antioch], *Commentary on the Hexaëmeron* 254f., *PG* XVIII. 729d.

(9.28.1) Περὶ δὲ τοῦ τὸν Μώϋσον ἐκτεθῆναι ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς εἰς τὸ ἕλος καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως θυγατρὸς ἀναιρεθῆναι καὶ τραφῆναι ἱστορεῖ καὶ Ἐζεκιῆλος ὁ τῶν τραγῳδιῶν ποιητής, ἄνωθεν ἀναλαβὼν τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀπὸ τῶν σὺν Ἰακὼβ παραγενομένων εἰς Αἴγυπτον πρὸς Ἰωσήφ. λέγει δὲ οὕτως, **τὸν Μώϋσον** παρεισάγων λέγοντα·

fr. 1
ἀφ' οὗ δ' Ἰακὼβ γῆν λιπὼν Χαναναίαν
κατῆλθ' ἔχων Αἴγυπτον ἑπτάκις δέκα
ψυχὰς σὺν αὐτῷ κἀπεγέννησεν πολὺν

[28] 58 ἀλλοτέρμων (cf. ἀγχιτέρμων etc.), 87 εἰσθεάομαι, 121 κολάστρια (κολαστήρ), 172 πρωτότευκτος (πρωτότοκος), 198 φαλαγγικός (φαλαγγίτης), 226 ἐκμήδομαι (μήδομαι), 231 εἰσκύρω (ἐγκύρω, προσκύρω), 259 μιλτόχρωτος (μιλτώδης), 260 κροκώτινος (κροκωτός). πλίνθευμα (9, < πλινθεύω) is paralleled only in *TrGF* adesp. F 269.

[29] ἑός possessive, 38 n.; ὅς demonstrative, 43 n.; article as relative, 70 n.

[30] ἐν 'with', 9 n., 132 n.; infinitives of purpose, 20 n.; αὐτός 'he' 118 n.

and Sositheus.[31] *Again there are a few liberties compared with previous tragic practice:*[32] *verb-endings -μαι and -ται elided in lines 82, 128, 149;*[33] *hiatus in 235 and probably 252, 255 (line 105 with the names Ἀβραάμ, Ἰσαάκ and Ἰακώβ is a special case); violations of Porson's Law in 163 and 174 (marginal instances in 131 and 233). The manuscripts show crasis of καὶ + ἐ-, καὶ + ἀ- and τὰ + ἀ- in some cases (κἄπειτα 19, 224, κἀγώ 29, 73, κἀμοί 81, κἀπογυμνῶσαι 47, τἀρσενικά 13, 174, τἀξ 117) but not in others (e.g. καὶ ἐπεγέννησεν 3, καὶ ἀποχώρησον 122) and not at all for other combinations (καὶ + ἐ-, ἀ-, αὐ-, οὐ-, ὑ-, τὰ + ὑ-). Some editors retain the inconsistent manuscript forms (e.g. Wieneke, Mras, Snell), some adjust them inconsistently (Gifford, Kuiper). I print crasis throughout (as Dübner did), although the combination τὰ + ὑ- (θὑπένερθε 88, θὑπ' ἐμοῦ 111) is admittedly unparalleled.*

EXAGÔGÊ

Eusebius, *Preparation for the Gospel* quoting Alexander Polyhistor, *On the Jews*:

(9.28.1) 'How Moses was exposed in the marshland by his mother and found and raised by the king's daughter is also told by Ezechiel the tragic poet, taking up the story from the point when Jacob and his family went to Egypt to join Joseph. He tells it as follows, introducing **Moses** saying:

fr. 1 Ever since Jacob left the Canaanite land and came down to
Egypt with seventy souls and begot a numerous people which

[31] Compare also the rates in the largest fourth-century samples: Chaeremon 36% in 69 lines, Theodectas 26% in 62 lines. The rates within the *Exagôgê* vary considerably with the subject-matter: high in the prologue-speech (46%), plagues description (65%) and Passover instructions (49%), low in the messenger-speech (16%) and scout's report (19%).

[32] »» Snell 1966, Strugnell 1967.

[33] West (1982, 10 n. 15) lists four examples from late fifth-century tragedy but all are very uncertain.

λαὸν κακῶς πράσσοντα καὶ τεθλιμμένον,
ἐσάχρι τούτων τῶν χρόνων κακούμεθα
κακῶν ὑπ᾽ ἀνδρῶν καὶ δυναστείας χερός.
ἰδὼν γὰρ ἡμῶν γένναν ἅλις ηὐξημένην
δόλον καθ᾽ ἡμῶν πολὺν ἐμηχανήσατο
βασιλεὺς Φαραώ, τοὺς μὲν ἐν πλινθεύμασιν
οἰκοδομίαις τε βαρέσιν αἰκίζων βροτοὺς
πόλεις τ᾽ ἐπύργου σφῶν ἕκατι δυσμόρων.
ἔπειτα κηρύσσει μὲν Ἑβραίων γένει
τὰρσενικὰ ῥίπτειν ποταμὸν ἐς βαθύρροον.
ἐνταῦθα μήτηρ ἡ τεκοῦσ᾽ ἔκρυπτέ με
τρεῖς μῆνας, ὡς ἔφασκεν· οὐ λαθοῦσα δὲ
ὑπεξέθηκε, κόσμον ἀμφιθεῖσά μοι,
παρ᾽ ἄκρα ποταμοῦ λάσιον εἰς ἕλος δασύ·
Μαριὰμ δ᾽ ἀδελφή μου κατώπτευεν πέλας.
κἄπειτα θυγάτηρ βασιλέως ἅβραις ὁμοῦ
κατῆλθε λουτροῖς χρῶτα φαιδρῦναι νέον·
ἰδοῦσα δ᾽ εὐθὺς καὶ λαβοῦσ᾽ ἀνείλετο,
ἔγνω δ᾽ Ἑβραῖον ὄντα· καὶ λέγει τάδε
Μαριὰμ ἀδελφὴ προσδραμοῦσα βασιλίδι·
Θέλεις τροφόν σοι παιδὶ τῷδ᾽ εὕρω ταχὺ
ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραίων; ἡ δ᾽ ἐπέσπευσεν κόρην.
μολοῦσα δ᾽ εἶπε μητρὶ καὶ παρῆν ταχὺ
αὐτή τε μήτηρ κἄλαβέν μ᾽ ἐς ἀγκάλας.
εἶπεν δὲ θυγάτηρ βασιλέως· Τοῦτον, γύναι,
τρόφευε, κἀγὼ μισθὸν ἀποδώσω σέθεν.
ὄνομα δὲ Μωσῆν ὠνόμαζε, τοῦ χάριν
ὑγρᾶς ⟨μ᾽⟩ ἀνεῖλε ποταμίας ἀπ᾽ ᠈ηόνος.

τούτοις μεθ᾽ ἕτερα ἐπιλέγει⟨· ⟩ καὶ περὶ τούτων ὁ Ἐζεκιῆλος ἐν τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ, **τὸν Μωσῆν** παρεισάγων λέγοντα·

fr. 2 ἐπεὶ δὲ καιρὸς νηπίων παρῆλθέ μοι,
ἦγέν με μήτηρ βασιλίδος πρὸς δώματα,
ἅπαντα μυθεύσασα καὶ λέξασά μοι
γένος πατρῷον καὶ θεοῦ δωρήματα.

5 κακούμεθα Dübner -μενον Euseb. 10 οἰκοδομίαις Clem., Euseb. ms. N$^{corr.}$ οἰκοδομαῖς Euseb. 11 τ᾽ ἐπύργου Sylburg τε πύργους Euseb., Clem. 12 γένει Euseb., Clem. γένη Jacobson 17 δασύ Euseb. βαθύ Clem. 31 ⟨μ᾽⟩ Kuiper 31–32 ἐπιλέγει⟨· ⟩ Cropp, i.e. ⟨λέγει⟩ or ⟨φησί⟩

has fared badly and been much distressed, right up to the present we have been treated evilly[5] by evil men and by the ruler's hand. For seeing our race abundantly increased, king Pharaoh contrived much trickery against us, tormenting our men with burdensome brickmaking and building,[10] and was fortifying cities on these wretches' backs. Next he commanded all the race of Hebrews to throw their males into the deep-flowing river. At that point the mother who bore me kept me hidden for three months, so she said, but when she was detected[15] she put apparel on me and secretly set me out by the river's edge in some densely overgrown marshland, while my sister Mariam kept watch nearby. Then the king's daughter came down with her servants to cleanse her young skin with washing.[20] She saw me right away and took me and raised me up, and realised I was a Hebrew. My sister Mariam ran up and said to the princess, 'Do you want me to promptly find you a nurse for this child from amongst the Hebrews?'; and she urged the girl to do so.[25] Mariam went and told my mother, who promptly came herself and took me in her arms. And the king's daughter said, 'Nurse this child, woman, and I will give you your reward'. She named me Moses, because[30] she took me up from the watery river's strand.'

(Eusebius continues:) To these things, after other things, he (Alexander) adds: '<*And*> Ezechiel <*tells*> about these things too, introducing **Moses** saying:

fr. 2 And when the time of my infancy had passed, my mother brought me to the princess's palace, after telling me all our history and recounting our ancestry and God's gifts to us.[35]

ἕως μὲν οὖν τὸν παιδὸς εἶχομεν χρόνον,
τροφαῖσι βασιλικαῖσι καὶ παιδεύμασιν
ἅπανθ' ὑπισχνεῖθ', ὡς ἀπὸ σπλάγχνων ἐῶν·
ἐπεὶ δὲ πλήρης †κόλπος ἡμερῶν παρῆν,
ἐξῆλθον οἴκων βασιλικῶν, πρὸς ἔργα γὰρ
θυμός μ' ἄνωγε καὶ τέχνασμα βασιλέως.
ὁρῶ δὲ πρῶτον ἄνδρας ἐν χειρῶν νομαῖς,
τὸν μὲν ⟨τὸ⟩ γένος Ἑβραῖον, ὃν δ' Αἰγύπτιον.
ἰδὼν δ' ἐρήμους καὶ παρόντα μηδένα
ἐρρυσάμην ἀδελφόν, ὃν δ' ἔκτειν' ἐγώ,
ἔκρυψα δ' ἄμμῳ τοῦτον, ὥστε μὴ 'σιδεῖν
ἕτερόν τιν' ἡμᾶς κἀπογυμνῶσαι φόνον.
τῇ 'παύριον δὲ πάλιν ἰδὼν ἄνδρας δύο,
μάλιστα δ' αὐτοὺς συγγενεῖς, πατουμένους
λέγω· Τί τύπτεις ἀσθενέστερον σέθεν;
ὁ δ' εἶπεν· Ἡμῖν τίς σ' ἀπέστειλεν κριτὴν
ἢ 'πιστάτην ἐνταῦθα; μὴ κτενεῖς σύ με,
ὥσπερ τὸν ἐχθὲς ἄνδρα; καὶ δείσας ἐγὼ
ἔλεξα· Πῶς ἐγένετο συμφανὲς τόδε;
καὶ πάντα βασιλεῖ ταῦτ' ἀπηγγέλη ταχύ·
ζητεῖ δὲ Φαραὼ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν λαβεῖν·
ἐγὼ δ' ἀκούσας ἐκποδὼν μεθίσταμαι
καὶ νῦν πλανῶμαι γῆν ἐπ' ἀλλοτέρμονα.

εἶτα περὶ τῶν τοῦ Ῥαγουὴλ θυγατέρων οὕτως ἐπιβάλλει·

fr. 3 ὁρῶ δὲ ταύτας ἑπτὰ παρθένους τινάς.

ἐρωτήσαντός τε αὐτὰς τίνες εἴησαν αἱ παρθένοι, φησὶν **ἡ Σεπφώρα**·

fr. 4 Λιβύη μὲν ἡ γῆ πᾶσα κλήζεται, ξένε,
οἰκοῦσι δ' αὐτὴν φῦλα παντοίων γενῶν,
Αἰθίοπες ἄνδρες μέλανες· ἄρχων δ' ἐστὶ γῆς
εἷς καὶ τύραννος καὶ στρατηλάτης μόνος.
ἄρχει δὲ πόλεως τῆσδε καὶ κρίνει βροτοὺς
ἱερεύς, ὅς ἐστ' ἐμοῦ τε καὶ τούτων πατήρ.

39 κόλπος Euseb. ms. I, Clem. κόλτος Euseb. mss. BON κύκλος Kuiper 43 ⟨τὸ⟩ Kuiper ὃν Dindorf τὸν Euseb. 46 μὴ εἰσιδεῖν mss.: cf. 77 49 πατ- ουμένους Dübner παρ- Euseb. 55 ἀπηγγέλη Kuiper ἀπήγγειλεν Euseb. (-αν Strugnell)

Now so long as I was in the period of my boyhood, she promised me all with royal nurture and education, as if I was her own offspring. But when a full *cycle?* of days was at hand, I set out from the royal palace, for my spirit urged me[40] towards the works the king had devised. Then first I saw two men who had come to blows, one a Hebrew by birth, the other Egyptian. And seeing they were alone and no one else was there, I rescued my brother and killed the other one,[45] and hid him in the sand so that no one else should see us and lay bare the killing. But on the next day I again saw two men – and these ones kinsmen – trampling each other, and said, 'Why are you beating someone weaker than yourself?'[50] He replied, 'Who sent you here to be our judge or overseer? Are you going to kill me, as you killed that man yesterday?' I was frightened and said, 'How did this become known?'; and all was promptly reported to the king.[55] Pharaoh then sought to take my life, but I heard of it and got away, and now am wandering in this foreign land.

'Then concerning the daughters of Raguel he (**Moses**) adds this:

fr. 3 But I see seven maidens here.

'And when he has asked them who the maidens are, **Sepphora** says:

fr. 4 This whole land is called Libya, stranger,[60] and tribes of all kinds of lineage inhabit it, black-skinned Ethiopian men. There is just one ruler of the land, both monarch and army commander. And governing this community and giving judgment to men is a priest, and he is father to me and my sisters here.[65]

εἶτα περὶ τοῦ ποτισμοῦ τῶν θρεμμάτων διελθὼν περὶ τοῦ Σεπφώρας ἐπιβάλλει γάμου, δι' ἀμοιβαίων παρεισάγων **τόν τε Χοὺμ** καὶ **τὴν Σεπφώραν** λέγοντας·

fr. 5

(Χου.) ὅμως κατειπεῖν χρή σε, Σεπφώρα, τάδε.
(Σεπ.) ξένῳ πατήρ με τῷδ' ἔδωκεν εὐνέτιν.

*9.29.1–3 are an excerpt from Demetrius (*FGrH *722 F 2): see opposite.*

(9.29.4) λέγει δὲ περὶ τούτων καὶ Ἐζεκιῆλος ἐν τῇ Ἐξαγωγῇ, προσπαρειληφὼς τὸν ὄνειρον τὸν ὑπὸ Μωσέως μὲν ἑωραμένον, ὑπὸ δὲ πενθεροῦ διακεκριμένον. λέγει δὲ αὐτὸς **ὁ Μωσῆς** δι' ἀμοιβαίων πρὸς τὸν πενθερὸν οὕτως πως·

fr. 6

ἔδοξ' ὄρους κατ' ἄκρα Σιναίου θρόνον
μέγαν τιν' εἶναι μέχρι 'ς οὐρανοῦ πτυχάς,
ἐν τῷ καθῆσθαι φῶτα γενναῖόν τινα
διάδημ' ἔχοντα καὶ μέγα σκῆπτρον χερὶ
εὐωνύμῳ μάλιστα. δεξιᾷ δέ μοι
ἔνευσε, κἀγὼ πρόσθεν ἐστάθην θρόνου.
σκῆπτρον δέ μοι πάρδωκε κεἰς θρόνον μέγαν
εἶπεν καθῆσθαι· βασιλικὸν δ' ἔδωκέ μοι
διάδημα καὐτὸς ἐκ θρόνων χωρίζεται.
ἐγὼ δ' ἐσεῖδον γῆν ἅπασαν ἔγκυκλον
κἄνερθε γαίας κἀξύπερθεν οὐρανοῦ,
καί μοί τι πλῆθος ἀστέρων πρὸς γούνατα
ἔπιπτ', ἐγὼ δὲ πάντας ἠριθμησάμην,
κἀμοὶ παρῆγεν ὡς παρεμβολὴ βροτῶν.
εἶτ' ἐμφοβηθεὶς ἐξανίσταμ' ἐξ ὕπνου.

ὁ δὲ πενθερὸς αὐτοῦ τὸν ὄνειρον ἐπικρίνει οὕτως·

fr. 7

ὦ ξένε, καλόν σοι τοῦτ' ἐσήμηνεν θεός·
ζῴην δ', ὅταν σοι ταῦτα συμβαίνῃ ποτέ.
ἆρά γε μέγαν τιν' ἐξαναστήσεις θρόνον
καὐτὸς βραβεύσεις καὶ καθηγήσῃ βροτῶν;
τὸ δ' εἰσθεᾶσθαι γῆν ὅλην τ' οἰκουμένην
καὶ θὐπένερθε χὐπὲρ οὐρανὸν θεοῦ·
ὄψει τά τ' ὄντα τά τε πρὸ τοῦ τά θ' ὕστερον.

68 ἔδοξ' . . . κατ' ἄκρα Σιναίου Dübner ἐξ . . . κατ' ἄκρας ινου *vel sim.* Euseb. mss. 69 πτύχας (*sic*) Euseb. mss BON πτυχός ms. I 74 πάρδωκε Snell, Strugnell παρέδωκε Euseb. 78 καὶ ἔνερθε Euseb. τά τ' ἔνερθε Münscher 81 κἀμοὶ Stephanus κἀμοῦ Euseb. 84 συμβαίνῃ Stephanus -βαίῃ Euseb. 85 θρόνον Euseb. -ου Stählin

'Then after telling about the watering of the livestock he (Ezechiel) adds something about Sepphora's marriage, introducing **Choum** and **Sepphora** speaking in dialogue:

fr. 5

Choum. Still, you must declare these things, Sepphora.
Sepphora. My father has given me in marriage to this stranger.'

Alexander here inserts an excerpt from the historian Demetrius concerning Moses' flight to Midian, his marriage with Sepphora and their joint descent from Abraham. He then returns to Ezechiel:

(9.29.4) 'Ezechiel too speaks about these things in the *Exagôgê*, including also the dream seen by Moses and interpreted by his father-in-law. **Moses** himself speaks in dialogue with his father-in-law somewhat like this:

fr. 6 I thought there was a great throne on the peaks of Mount Sinai reaching to heaven's folds, on which was seated a noble man[70] holding a diadem and a great sceptre in his left hand. He gestured with his right hand, and I stood before the throne. He handed me the sceptre and told me to be seated on the great throne, and gave me the royal[75] diadem and himself vacated the throne. Then I beheld all the encircled earth and below the earth and above the sky, and a multitude of stars fell at my knees, and I made a count of them all,[80] and they marched past me like a mortal host. Then filled with fear I arose from sleep.

'And **his father-in-law** interprets the dream in this way:

fr. 7 Stranger, this is a fair sign God has given you. May I be living when these things come to pass for you! Surely you will raise up a great throne[85] and will yourself be a judge and leader of men. As for your seeing all the inhabited earth and the realms below and those above God's heaven, you shall see what is and what was before and what is to come.

περὶ δὲ τῆς καιομένης βάτου καὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς αὐτοῦ τῆς πρὸς Φαραὼ πάλιν παρεισάγει δι' ἀμοιβαίων τὸν Μωσῆν τῷ θεῷ διαλεγόμενον. φησὶ δὲ **ὁ Μωσῆς**·

fr. 8 ἔα· τί μοι σημεῖον ἐκ βάτου τόδε,
τεράστιόν τε καὶ βροτοῖς ἀπιστία;
ἄφνω βάτος μὲν καίεται πολλῷ πυρί,
αὐτοῦ δὲ χλωρὸν πᾶν μένει τὸ βλαστάνον.
τί δή; προελθὼν ὄψομαι τεράστιον
μέγιστον· οὐ γὰρ πίστιν ἀνθρώποις φέρει.

εἶτα **ὁ θεὸς** αὐτῷ προσομιλεῖ·

fr. 9 ἔπισχες, ὦ φέριστε, μὴ προσεγγίσῃς,
Μωσῆ, πρὶν ἢ τῶν σῶν ποδῶν λῦσαι δέσιν·
ἁγία γὰρ ἧς σὺ γῆς ἐφέστηκας πέλει,
ὁ δ' ἐκ βάτου σοι θεῖος ἐκλάμπει λόγος.
θάρσησον, ὦ παῖ, καὶ λόγων ἄκου' ἐμῶν·
ἰδεῖν γὰρ ὄψιν τὴν ἐμὴν ἀμήχανον
θνητὸν γεγῶτα, τῶν λόγων δ' ἔξεστί σοι
ἐμῶν ἀκούειν, τῶν ἔκατ' ἐλήλυθα.
ἐγὼ θεὸς σῶν ὧν λέγεις γεννητόρων,
Ἀβραάμ τε καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβου τρίτου.
μνησθεὶς δ' ἐκείνων κἄτ' ἐμῶν δωρημάτων
πάρειμι σῶσαι λαὸν Ἑβραίων ἐμόν,
ἰδὼν κάκωσιν καὶ πόνον δούλων ἐμῶν.
ἀλλ' ἔρπε καὶ σήμαινε τοῖς ἐμοῖς λόγοις
πρῶτον μὲν αὐτοῖς πᾶσιν Ἑβραίοις ὁμοῦ,
ἔπειτα βασιλεῖ θὐπ' ἐμοῦ τεταγμένα,
ὅπως σὺ λαὸν τὸν ἐμὸν ἐξάγοις χθονός.

εἶτα ὑποβάς τινα ἀμοιβαῖα αὐτὸς **ὁ Μωσῆς** λέγει·

fr. 10 οὐκ εὔλογος πέφυκα, γλῶσσα δ' ἐστί μοι
δύσφραστος, ἰσχνόφωνος, ὥστε μὴ λόγους
ἐμοὺς γενέσθαι βασιλέως ἐναντίον.

εἶτα πρὸς ταῦτα **ὁ θεὸς** αὐτῷ ἀποκρίνεται·

fr. 11 Ἀάρωνα πέμψω σὸν κασίγνητον ταχύ,
ᾧ πάντα λέξεις τἀξ ἐμοῦ λελεγμένα,
καὐτὸς λαλήσει βασιλέως ἐναντίον,
σὺ μὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὁ δὲ λαβὼν σέθεν πάρα.

98 ἧς σὺ γῆς Dübner ἡ γῆ ὅπου σὺ Euseb. 115 ἐναντίον Stephanus -ους Euseb.

'And concerning the burning bush and his mission to Pharaoh he (Ezechiel) again introduces Moses conversing in dialogue with God. And **Moses** says:

fr. 8 Ah! What portent is this coming from the bush,[90] a prodigy incredible to mortals? Suddenly the bush is burning with abundant fire, yet all its foliage is still verdant. What then? I'll go up and view this prodigy, for it defies human belief.[95]

'Then **God** addresses him:

fr. 9 Hold, excellent Moses, do not come close until you have unloosed the sandals from your feet. The ground you are standing on is holy ground, and the word of God shines out to you from the bush. Take courage, my son, and listen to my words.[100] It is impossible for one born mortal to see my face, but it is permitted for you to hear my words, which I have come to tell you. I am the god of those you call your ancestors, Abraham and Isaac and thirdly Jacob.[105] I have remembered them and my gifts to them also, and I am here to rescue my people, the Hebrews, since I have seen the ill-treatment and suffering of my servants. But go and declare in my words, first to all the Hebrews themselves assembled,[110] then to the king, my instructions that you should lead my people out of the land.

'Then after some further exchanges **Moses** himself says:

fr. 10 I am not good with words, my tongue is faltering and weak-voiced, so my words cannot be delivered before the king.[115]

'Then in reply to this **God** says to him:

fr. 11 I will send Aaron your brother promptly, to whom you shall tell everything that I have said, and he shall speak before the king, you conversing with me and he receiving from you.

περὶ δὲ τῆς ῥάβδου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τεράτων οὕτω δι' ἀμοιβαίων εἴρηκε·

fr. 12

Θεός τί δ' ἐν χεροῖν σοῖν τοῦτ' ἔχεις; λέξον τάχος.
Μωσῆς ῥάβδον τετραπόδων καὶ βροτῶν κολάστριαν.
Θε. ῥῖψον πρὸς οὖδας κἀποχώρησον ταχύ.
δράκων γὰρ ἔσται φοβερός, ὥστε θαυμάσαι.
Μω. ἰδοὺ βέβληται· δέσποθ', ἵλεως γενοῦ·
ὡς φοβερός, ὡς πέλωρος· οἴκτειρον σύ με·
πέφρικ' ἰδών, μέλη δὲ σώματος τρέμει.
Θε. μηδὲν φοβηθῇς, χεῖρα δ' ἐκτείνας λαβὲ
οὐράν, πάλιν δὲ ῥάβδος ἔσσεθ' ὥσπερ ἦν.
ἔνθες δὲ χεῖρ' εἰς κόλπον ἐξένεγκέ τε.
Μω. ἰδοὺ τὸ ταχθέν, γέγονεν ὡσπερεὶ χιών.
Θε. ἔνθες πάλιν δ' εἰς κόλπον, ἔσται δ' ὥσπερ ἦν.

τούτοις ἐπάγει, μετά τινα τὰ μεταξὺ αὐτῷ εἰρημένα, λέγων· Ταῦτα δέ φησιν οὕτως καὶ Ἐζεκιῆλος ἐν τῇ Ἐξαγωγῇ λέγων, περὶ μὲν τῶν σημείων **τὸν θεὸν** παρεισάγων λέγοντα οὕτως·

fr. 13

Θεός ἐν τῇδε ῥάβδῳ πάντα ποιήσεις κακά·
πρῶτον μὲν αἷμα ποτάμιον ῥυήσεται
πηγαί τε πᾶσαι χὐδάτων συστήματα·
βατράχων τε πλῆθος σκνῖπα τ' ἐμβαλῶ χθονί.
ἔπειτα τέφραν οἷς καμιναίαν πάσω,
ἀναβρυήσει δ' ἐν βροτοῖς ἕλκη πικρά.
κυνόμυια δ' ἥξει καὶ βροτοὺς Αἰγυπτίων
πολλοὺς κακώσει. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτ' ἔσται πάλιν
λοιμός, θανοῦνται δ' οἷς ἔνεστι καρδία
σκληρά. πικράνω δ' οὐρανόν· χάλαζα νῦν
σὺν πυρὶ πεσεῖται καὶ νεκροὺς θήσει βροτούς,
καρποί τ' ὀλοῦνται τετραπόδων τε σώματα.
σκότος τε θήσω τρεῖς ἐφ' ἡμέρας ὅλας
ἀκρίδας τε πέμψω, καὶ περισσὰ βρώματα
ἅπαντ' ἀναλώσουσι καὶ καρποῦ χλόην.
ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις τέκν' ἀποκτενῶ βροτῶν
πρωτόγονα· παύσω δ' ὕβριν ἀνθρώπων κακῶν.
Φαραὼ δὲ βασιλεὺς πείσετ' οὐδὲν ὧν λέγω,
πλὴν τέκνον αὐτοῦ πρωτόγονον ἕξει νεκρόν·
καὶ τότε φοβηθεὶς λαὸν ἐκπέμψει ταχύ.

135 σκνῖπα τ' Strugnell καὶ σκνῖπας Euseb. (two half-verses lost before this: Snell)

'And concerning the staff and the other prodigies he (Ezechiel) has told in dialogue as follows:

fr. 12

God. What is this you are holding in your hand? Tell me promptly.[120]

Moses. A staff for chastising four-footed beasts and humans.

God. Throw it on the ground and retire promptly. It will be a fearsome serpent, and you will be amazed.

Moses. There, it is thrown — O lord, be merciful! How frightful, how monstrous — take pity on me![125] I shudder on seeing it, the limbs of my body tremble.

God. Fear not: stretch out your hand and take its tail, and it will be a staff once again as it was. Then put your hand in the fold of your garment and bring it out.

Moses. There, I have done it; it has become just like snow.[130]

God. Now put it back in the fold, and it will be as it was.'

(Eusebius continues:) To these things he (Alexander) adds, after some intervening statements: 'And Ezechiel too says these things in this way, telling them in the *Exagôgê*, introducing **God** telling about the signs as follows:

fr. 13

God. With this staff you will cause every affliction. First the river will flow blood, and all the streams and bodies of water; and I will cast a swarm of frogs and the mosquito(?) upon the land.[135] Next I will scatter furnace-ashes on them, and harsh sores will flare up on people. The dogfly will come and will afflict many people of the Egyptians. And after this again there will be a pestilence, and those will die whose hearts are hard within them.[140] I will harshen the heaven; now hail will fall with fire and will turn people into corpses, and crops and bodies of four-footed beasts will perish. I will impose darkness over three whole days, and I will send locusts and they will destroy all the remaining food and vegetation. On top of all this I will kill people's first-born children; and I will end the abuses of these evil men. But king Pharaoh will heed none of the things I am describing, unless he holds his first-born child as a corpse;[150] and then he will take fright and will promptly send out my people.

πρὸς τοῖσδε λέξεις πᾶσιν Ἑβραίοις ὁμοῦ·
Ὁ μεὶς ὅδ’ ὑμῖν πρῶτος ἐνιαυτῶν πέλει·
ἐν τῷδ’ ἀπάξω λαὸν εἰς ἄλλην χθόνα,
εἰς ἣν ὑπέστην πατράσιν Ἑβραίων γένους.
λέξεις δὲ λαῷ παντί, μηνὸς οὗ λέγω
διχομηνίᾳ τὸ πάσχα θύσαντας θεῷ
†τῇ πρόσθε νυκτὶ† αἵματι ψαῦσαι θύρας,
ὅπως παρέλθῃ σῆμα δεινὸς ἄγγελος·
ὑμεῖς δὲ νυκτὸς ὀπτὰ δαίσεσθε κρέα.
σπουδῇ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐκβαλεῖ πρόπαντ’ ὄχλον.
ὅταν δὲ μέλλητ’ ἀποτρέχειν, δώσω χάριν
λαῷ, γυνή τε παρὰ γυναικὸς λήψεται
σκεύη κόσμον τε πάνθ’ ὃν ἄνθρωπος φέρει,
†χρυσόν τε καὶ ἄργυρον ἠδὲ καὶ στολὰς†
ἵν’ ὧν ἔπραξαν μισθὸν ἀποδῶσιν βροτοῖς.
ὅταν δ’ ἐς ἴδιον χῶρον εἰσέλθητ’, ὅπως
ἀφ’ ἥσπερ ἠοῦς ἐφύγετ’ Αἰγύπτου δ’ ἄπο
ἕπτ’ ⟨ἦθ’⟩ ὁδοιποροῦντες ἡμέρας ὁδόν,
πάντες τοσαύτας ἡμέρας ἔτος κάτα
ἄζυμ’ ἔδεσθε καὶ θεῷ λατρεύσετε,
τὰ πρωτότευκτα ζῷα θύοντες θεῷ,
ὅσ’ ἂν τέκωσι παρθένοι πρώτως τέκνα
τἀρσενικὰ διανοίγοντα μήτρας μητέρων.

καὶ πάλιν περὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ταύτης ἑορτῆς φησὶν ἐπεξεργαζόμενον ἀκριβέστερον εἰρηκέναι·

fr. 14
(Μωσ.?) ἀνδρῶν Ἑβραίων τοῦδε τοῦ μηνὸς λαβὼν
κατὰ συγγενείας πρόβατα καὶ μόσχους βοῶν
ἄμωμα δεκάτῃ· καὶ φυλαχθήτω μέχρι
τετρὰς ἐπιλάμψει δεκάδι, καὶ πρὸς ἑσπέραν

158 τῆς πρόσθε νυκτὸς Kuiper τῇ (*sc.* ὥρᾳ) πρόσθε νυκτός? Cropp 164 σκεύη τε κόσμον θ’ ὅλον Snell 165 del. Dübner reading χρυσοῦν τε κἀργύρειον etc. (χρυσόν τε καὶ τὸν ἄργυρον Mras) χρυσοῦν τε κἀργυροῦν ἠδὲ στολάς, ἵνα | ⟨ἀνθ’⟩ ὧν Stephanus (χρυσόν τε κἄργυρον ἠδὲ καὶ Dindorf, χρυσόν τε κἄργυρόν τε καὶ Snell) 168 δ’ ἄπο Euseb. ἄπο Stephanus πέδον Kuiper 169 ἕπτ’ ⟨ἦτ’⟩ (i.e. ⟨ἦθ’⟩) Snell ἑπτὰ δ’ Euseb. ms. I ἑπτὰ BON after 174: ἐπεξεργαζόμενον Stephanus -ης Euseb. ms. I -ος mss. ON (ἐπεξεργαζόμενον etc. om. ms. B)

In addition to this you shall say to all the Hebrews assembled: 'This month is the first one of your years. In this month I will lead my people away into another land, the land I promised the fathers of the Hebrews' race I would lead them into.'[155] And you shall tell all the people, at the full moon of the month I speak of, to make the Pascha sacrifice to God before nightfall and brush the doors with blood, so that the terrible angel may pass by the sign; and †*on the previous night*† you shall feast on the flesh, roasted.[160] The king will speedily expel the whole multitude. And when you are about to run off, I will grant the people a favour, and woman will take from woman ornaments and clothing of all the kinds that a person wears, †*gold and silver and also apparel*†,[165] so they may render payment to the people for what they have done. And when you have entered your own country, just as, from the dawn when you fled from Egypt you were travelling for seven days, for so many days each year you shall all[170] eat unleavened bread and give service to God, sacrificing to God the first-born beasts, those that are male and born for the first time by maiden females, opening their mothers' wombs.'

(Eusebius continues:) 'And again, concerning this same festival, he (Alexander) says that he (Ezechiel) has elaborated and told more precisely:

fr. 14

(Moses?) . . . of the Hebrew men on the tenth day of this month shall take,[175] family by family, unblemished sheep or goats and bullocks. Let these be kept until the fourth day dawns after the

θύσαντες ὀπτὰ πάντα σὺν τοῖς ἔνδοθεν
οὕτως φάγεσθε ταῦτα· περιεζωσμένοι
καὶ κοῖλα ποσσὶν ὑποδέδεσθε καὶ χερὶ
βακτηρίαν ἔχοντες· ἐν σπουδῇ τε γὰρ
βασιλεὺς κελεύσει πάντας ἐκβαλεῖν χθονός.
κεκλήσεται δὲ Πάσχ', ὅταν θύσητε δέ,
δέσμην λαβόντες χερσὶν ὑσσώπου κόμης
εἰς αἷμα βάψαι καὶ θιγεῖν σταθμῶν δυοῖν,
ὅπως παρέλθῃ θάνατος Ἑβραίων ἄπο.
ταύτην δ' ἑορτὴν δεσπότῃ τηρήσετε,
ἕφθ' ἡμέρας ἄζυμα, κοὐ βρωθήσεται
ζύμη· κακῶν γὰρ τῶνδ' †ἀπαλλαγήσεται.
καὶ τοῦδε μηνὸς ἔξοδον διδοῖ θεός,
ἀρχὴ δὲ μηνῶν καὶ χρόνων οὗτος πέλει.

πάλιν μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιλέγει· Φησὶ δὲ καὶ Ἐζεκιῆλος ἐν τῷ δράματι τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Ἐξαγωγή, παρεισάγων **ἄγγελον** λέγοντα τήν τε τῶν Ἑβραίων διάθεσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων φθορὰν οὕτως·

fr. 15 ὡς γὰρ σὺν ὄχλῳ τῷδ' ἀφώρμησεν δόμων
βασιλεὺς Φαραώ, μυρίων ὅπλων μέτα
ἵππου τε πάσης χαρμάτων τετραόρων
καὶ προστάταισι καὶ παραστάταις ὁμοῦ,
ἦν φρικτὸς ἀνδρῶν ἐκτεταγμένων ὄχλος,
πεζοὶ μὲν ἐν μέσοισι καὶ φαλαγγικοὶ
διεκδρομὰς ἔχοντες ἅρμασιν τόπους,
ἱππεῖς δ' ἔταξε τοὺς μὲν ἐξ εὐωνύμων,
ἐκ δεξιῶν δὲ πάντας Αἰγυπτίου στρατοῦ.
τὸν πάντα δ' αὐτῶν ἀριθμὸν ἠρόμην ἐγώ {στρατοῦ}·
μυριάδες ⟨ἦσαν⟩ ἑκατὸν εὐάνδρου λεώ{ς}.
ἐπεὶ δ' Ἑβραίων οὐμὸς ἤντησε στρατός,
οἱ μὲν παρ' ἀκτὴν πλησίον βεβλημένοι
Ἐρυθρᾶς Θαλάσσης ἦσαν ἠθροϊσμένοι·
οἱ μὲν τέκνοισι νηπίοις δίδουν βορὰν
ὁμοῦ τε καὶ δάμαρσιν, ἔγκοποι πόνῳ·
κτήνη τε πολλὰ καὶ δόμων ἀποσκευή·

184 Πάσχ' Strugnell πᾶς καὶ Euseb. (καὶ del. Dindorf) 190 ἐστι τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγή Kuiper ἀπαλλαγὴν (Münscher) νέμει Gibert 193 τῷδ' Euseb. τῶνδ' Lanfranchi 202 αὐτῶν ἀριθμὸν Gifford ἀρ- αὐτ- Euseb. {στρατοῦ} Kuiper 203 ⟨ἦσαν⟩, λεώ{ς} Dindorf 208 ἔγκοποι (Jacobson) πόνῳ Sansone ἔμπονοι κόπῳ Euseb.

tenth, and towards evening sacrifice them and eat all of them roasted including the innards in this way: girded up,[180] and have sandals strapped to your feet, and holding a staff in your hands, for the king will give orders to cast you all out with speed from the land. It shall be called Pascha, and when you sacrifice, take in your hands a bunch of hyssop-stems,[185] dip it in blood and touch it to both doorposts, so that death may pass by, away from the Hebrews. This festival you shall observe for the Lord — seven days unleavened, no leavening shall be consumed; for †*it will be released*† from these ills.[190] And in this month God provides an exodus; this month is the beginning of months and years.'

(Eusebius continues:) 'Again, after other things he (Alexander) adds: 'And Ezechiel too says this in the play entitled *Exagôgê*, introducing **a messenger** telling the situation of the Hebrews and the destruction of the Egyptians as follows:

fr. 15 When king Pharaoh set forth from his palace with this host, with ten thousand armed men and all the cavalry and four-horse chariots,[195] along with their commanders and lieutenants, there was a terrifying host of men arrayed, infantry and phalanx-men in the centre with spaces for chariots to pass through, while all the cavalry he disposed some on the left[200] and some on the right of the Egyptian army. I asked their total number: there were one hundred myriads of able-bodied troops. But when my army came upon the Hebrews, they for their part were gathered lying close beside the shore of the Red Sea;[206] some were giving food to their little children along with their wives, wearied with toil; there were quantities of livestock and household equipment.

αὐτοὶ δ’ ἄνοπλοι πάντες εἰς μάχην χέρας
ἰδόντες ἡμᾶς ἠλάλαξαν ἔνδακρυν
φωνήν, πρὸς αἰθέρ’ ἀπετάθησαν ἀθρόοι
θεὸν πατρῷον. ἦν πολὺς δ’ ἀνδρῶν ὄχλος·
ἡμᾶς δὲ χάρμα πάντας εἶχεν ἐν μέρει.
ἔπειθ’ ὑπ’ αὐτοὺς θήκαμεν παρεμβολήν
(Βεελζεφών τις κλῄζεται πόλις βροτοῖς).
ἐπεὶ δὲ Τιτὰν ἥλιος δυσμαῖς προσῆν,
ἐπέσχομεν, θέλοντες ὄρθριον μάχην,
πεποιθότες λαοῖσι καὶ φρικτοῖς ὅπλοις.
ἔπειτα θείων ἄρχεται τεραστίων
θαυμάστ’ ἰδέσθαι. καί τις ἐξαίφνης μέγας
στῦλος νεφώδης ἐστάθη †πρὸ γῆς μέγας†
παρεμβολῆς ἡμῶν τε χἀβραίων μέσος.
κἄπειθ’ ὁ κείνων ἡγεμὼν Μωσῆς, λαβὼν
ῥάβδον θεοῦ, τῇ δὴ πρὶν Αἰγύπτῳ κακὰ
σημεῖα καὶ τεράστι’ ἐξεμήσατο,
ἔτυψ’ Ἐρυθρᾶς νῶτα κἄσχισεν μέσον
βάθος Θαλάσσης· οἱ δὲ σύμπαντες σθένει
ὤρουσαν ὠκεῖς ἁλμυρᾶς δι’ ἀτραπιτοῦ.
ἡμεῖς δ’ ἐπ’ αὐτῆς ᾠχόμεσθα συντόμως
κατ’ ἴχνος αὐτῶν· νυκτὸς εἰσεκύρσαμεν
βοηδρομοῦντες· ἁρμάτων δ’ ἄφνω τροχοὶ
οὐκ ἐστρέφοντο, δέσμιοι δ’ ὡς ἥρμοσαν.
ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ δὲ φέγγος ὡς πυρὸς μέγα
ὤφθη τι ἡμῖν· ὡς μὲν εἰκάζειν, παρῆν
αὐτοῖς ἀρωγὸς ὁ θεός. ὡς δ’ ἤδη πέραν
ἦσαν θαλάσσης, κῦμα δ’ ἐρροίβδει μέγα
σύνεγγυς ἡμῶν. καί τις ἠλάλαξ’ ἰδών·
Φεύγωμεν οἴκοι πρόσθεν Ὑψίστου χερός·
οἷς μὲν γάρ ἐστ’ ἀρωγός, ἡμῖν δ’ ἀθλίοις
ὄλεθρον ἕρδει. καὶ συνεκλύσθη πόρος
Ἐρυθρᾶς Θαλάσσης καὶ στρατὸν διώλεσε.

καὶ πάλιν μετ’ ὀλίγα· Ἐκεῖθεν ἦλθον ἡμέρας τρεῖς, ὡς αὐτός τε ὁ Δημήτριος λέγει (*FGrH* 722 F 4) καὶ συμφώνως τούτῳ ἡ ἱερὰ βίβλος. μὴ ἔχοντα δὲ ὕδωρ

212 ἀπετάθησαν Strugnell τε τάθησαν Euseb. ms. B (τε ἐστάθ- I, τ’ ἐστάθ- ON) 222 πρὸ ἡμέρας E. Stein πρὸς ἑσπέραν Lanfranchi πρόσθεν στρατοῦ (*e.g.*) Cropp 226 τεράστι’ Gaisford τέρατα Euseb. τεράατ’ Mras 239 χερός Stephanus χέρας Euseb. 242 στρατὸν Stephanus πόρον Euseb.

And they, being all unarmed for battle,[210] on seeing us yelled out a tearful cry — they complained to the heavens at their ancestral god; and there was much commotion, and we all in turn relished the sight. Then we pitched a camp close up to them[215] (there is a town there that men call Beelzephon). But as the Titan Sun was close to setting we held off, wanting a battle at dawn, confident in our hosts and terrible armaments.[219] Then things wondrous to see, divine prodigies, began. Suddenly a great column of cloud stood *†great in front of earth†* between our encampment and the Hebrews'. And then their leader Moses, taking the god's staff, the one he used before to contrive signs and prodigies harmful to Egypt,[226] struck the Red Sea's surface and split its depth asunder; and all of them together rushed with force swiftly through the briny passage. We too set off eagerly upon it,[230] following their tracks: we met with night as we chased with hue and cry; and suddenly our chariots' wheels would not turn but stuck as if bound fast. And from the heaven we saw a great fiery light: their god, I suppose, was present[235] helping them. And when they were already past the sea, then a great wave rolled up close upon us, and someone seeing it yelled, 'Let's flee to our homes before the Highest one's hand; he is helping them, and on us poor wretches[240] he is working destruction'. Then the Red Sea's path was engulfed and destroyed the army.'

(Eusebius continues:) And again a little later (Alexander says): 'From there they went for three days, as Demetrius himself says, and in agreement with him the Sacred Book. And as he (i.e. Moses) did not have sweet water there, but bitter,

ἐκεῖ γλυκύ, ἀλλὰ πικρόν, τοῦ θεοῦ εἰπόντος ξύλον τι ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν πηγὴν καὶ γενέσθαι γλυκὺ τὸ ὕδωρ. ἐκεῖθεν δὲ εἰς Ἐλεὶμ ἐλθεῖν καὶ εὑρεῖν ἐκεῖ δώδεκα μὲν πηγὰς ὑδάτων, ἑβδομήκοντα δὲ στελέχη φοινίκων. περὶ τούτων καὶ τοῦ φανέντος ὀρνέου Ἐξεκιῆλος ἐν τῇ Ἐξαγωγῇ παρεισάγει **τινὰ λέγοντα τῷ Μωσεῖ** περὶ μὲν τῶν φοινίκων καὶ τῶν δώδεκα πηγῶν οὕτως·

fr. 16 κράτιστε Μωσῆ, πρόσσχες, οἷον εὕρομεν
τόπον πρὸς αὐτῇ τῇδέ γ' εὐαεῖ νάπῃ.
ἔστιν γάρ, ὥς που καὶ σὺ τυγχάνεις ὁρῶν,
ἐκεῖ· τόθεν δὲ φέγγος ἐξέλαμψέ νυν
κατ' εὐφρόνης σημεῖον ὡς στῦλος πυρός.
ἐνταῦθα λειμῶν' εὕρομεν κατάσκιον
ὑγράς τε λιβάδας· δαψιλὴς χῶρος βαθύς,
πηγὰς ἀφύσσων δώδεκ' ἐκ μιᾶς πέτρας,
στελέχη δ' ἐρυμνὰ πολλὰ φοινίκων πέλει
ἔγκαρπα, δεκάκις ἑπτά, καὶ ἐπίρρυτος
πέφυκε χλοίῃ θρέμμασιν χορτάσματα.

εἶτα ὑποβὰς περὶ τοῦ φανέντος ὀρνέου διεξέρχεται·

fr. 17 ἕτερον δὲ πρὸς τοῖσδ' εἴδομεν ζῷον ξένον,
θαυμαστόν, οἷον οὐδέπω ὥρακέ τις.
διπλοῦν γὰρ ἦν τὸ μῆκος ἀετοῦ σχεδόν,
πτεροῖσι ποικίλοισιν ἠδὲ χρώμασι.
στῆθος μὲν αὐτοῦ πορφυροῦν ἐφαίνετο,
σκέλη δὲ μιλτόχρωτα, καὶ κατ' αὐχένων
κροκωτίνοις μαλλοῖσιν εὐτρεπίζετο.
κάρα δὲ κόττοις ἡμέροις παρεμφερές,
καὶ μηλίνῃ μὲν τῇ κόρῃ προσέβλεπε
κύκλῳ· κόρη δὲ κόκκος ὡς ἐφαίνετο.
φωνὴν δὲ πάντων εἶχεν ἐκπρεπεστάτην.
βασιλεὺς δὲ πάντων ὀρνέων ἐφαίνετο,
ὡς ἦν νοῆσαι· πάντα γὰρ τὰ πτήν' ὁμοῦ
ὄπισθεν αὐτοῦ δειλιῶντ' ἐπέσσυτο,
αὐτὸς δὲ πρόσθεν, ταῦρος ὡς γαυρούμενος,
ἔβαινε κραιπνὸν βῆμα βαστάζων ποδός.

243 πρόσσχες Kuiper πρό- Euseb. 244 τῇδέ γ' Dübner τῆδ' ἐπ' Euseb. ms. I (τῆδ' ἐπευνάει ms. O, -άι ms. N) 246 νυν Mras νιν Euseb. 252 ἐπίρρυτος Euseb. κατά- Kuiper περί- Wieneke 253 χλοίη Dübner χλόη Euseb. χλόη πέφυκε Gaisford 255 οὐδέπω ὥρακέ τις Euseb. οὐδεπώποτ' εἶδέ τις Kuiper (οὔτις εἶδε πώποτε Snell) 261 κοττοῖς *(sic)* ἡμέροις Voss (ἡμέροις Stephanus) κοίτης ἱμέροις Euseb. (ἡμέρης some later mss., ἡμέρας [Eustath.])

on God's instruction he threw a piece of wood into the spring and the water became sweet. And from there they came to Elim and found there twelve springs of water, and also seventy date-palms. Concerning these and the bird that appeared, Ezechiel in the *Exagôgê* introduces **someone** telling Moses about the date-palms and the twelve springs as follows:

fr. 16 Most mighty Moses, hear what kind of place we have found right next to this valley with its pleasant breezes. It is over there, as perhaps you too can see.[245] From there, then, a light shone down from the darkness, a sign like a column of fire. There we found a shaded meadow and flowing streams. It is a rich, luxuriant place, drawing twelve springs out of a single rock;[250] there are many sturdy palm-trees bearing fruit, seventy of them, and verdure grown, well-watered, as pasture for our flocks.

'Then further down he (Ezechiel) gives an account of the bird that appeared:

fr. 17 We saw another thing as well, a strange creature, a wondrous thing such as no one has seen before.[255] He was about twice the length of an eagle, with feathers of various colours. His breast appeared crimson, his legs were vermilion-coloured, and on his neck he was decked out with saffron-coloured tufts.[260] His head was similar to domestic cocks, and he looked about him with an eye that was quince-yellow, and the pupil resembled a seed. His cry was the most conspicuous of all birds. He appeared to be monarch of them all,[265] as one could apprehend; for all the winged creatures together rushed after him submissively, while he went before them like a swaggering bull, lifting his feet in rapid steps.'

Notes on Ezechiel's *Exagôgê*

1–59. The prologue speech

Frs 1 and 2 seem to represent nearly all of a prologue speech. Alexander's introduction makes it clear that line 1 begins Moses' narrative of the Israelites' sojourn in Egypt. Jacobson 70–72 argues that this was the play's first line (taking δέ as inceptive: cf. van der Horst 1984, 360f.), but it is unlikely that the play began without any indication of a dramatic setting (this need not have included Moses' name which may have been heard for the first time in lines 30f.). Some additional detail could be missing after lines 31 and 58, but see the notes at these points below.

1–31. Moses' birth and upbringing. The narrative is based on *Exodus* 1.1–2.10 but elides the time-lapse between Jacob's arrival with his family in Egypt and the Israelites' early prosperity and the beginning of their oppression which in *Exodus* is due to a new Pharaoh's fear that they might support a foreign invasion. Ezechiel understandably omits this motive and implies that the Israelites were oppressed from the start. The Pharaoh's attempt to get the Hebrew midwives to kill the newborn sons is also omitted, and the Israelites are ordered to do so rather than the Egyptians (see below on 12–13). The famous papyrus basket in which Moses was exposed (*Exod.* 2.3) was perhaps too familiar to need mentioning.

2. came down to Egypt with seventy souls: LXX *Genesis* 46.27 and *Exodus* 1.5 say 75, including five grandsons and great-grandsons of Joseph born in Egypt. The Hebrew text gives 70 consistently, but Ezechiel's wording seems to reflect LXX *Deuteronomy* 10.22, ἐν ἑβδομήκοντα ψυχαῖς κατέβησαν οἱ πατέρες σου εἰς Αἴγυπτον, 'Your fathers came down to Egypt with seventy souls': »» Jacobson 81–84, Lanfranchi 131f.

7f. Pharaoh contrived much trickery against us: in *Exodus* 1.10 the Pharaoh proposes to 'subtly suppress them' (κατασοφισώμεθα αὐτούς).

9f. with burdensome brickmaking and building: cf. *Exodus* 1.11 (the Israelites 'built strong cities for the Pharaoh: Pithom, Ramesses and On, which is Heliopolis') and 1.14, κατωδύνων αὐτῶν τὴν ζωὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς σκληροῖς, τῷ πηλῷ καὶ τῇ πλινθείᾳ etc. ('they tormented their life with harsh work, with clay and brickmaking'). The brickmaking was a special cause of complaint, aggravated when the Pharaoh forced them to collect their own straw (*Exod.* 5). **[ἐν πλινθεύμασιν οἰκοδομίαις τε** is a hendiadys, **βαρέσιν** agreeing with **πλινθεύμασιν**. Instrumental **ἐν**, **with** is common in the Septuagint and Koinê Greek (Blass–Debrunner §195; earlier examples, LSJ 'ἐν' III); here close to the basic sense 'in', less so in line 132.**]**

12f. he commanded all the race of Hebrews to throw their males etc.: Ezechiel probably meant to imply newborn males. In *Exodus* 1.22 the Egyptians are more plausibly ordered to do this themselves after the Hebrew midwives have refused to kill the babies as they are born. Ezechiel's account however

agrees with the *Book of Jubilees* 47.2 and *Acts* 7.19. Lanfranchi 134f. suggests the variant might have originated in a midrashic misreading of the Hebrew text of *Exodus*. [Jacobson's γένη (1977, 415f.) reconciles Ezechiel with *Exodus* ('he gave orders to kill all the Hebrews' male offspring') but seems unneeded.]

16. put apparel on me: *Exodus* 2.3 gives no such detail. **κόσμον** is vague but suggests more than simple clothing: cf. Eur. *Med.* 787 κἄνπερ . . . κόσμον ἀμφιθῇι χροΐ ('if she wraps the dress around her skin'), *Ion* 1433 στέφανον ἐλαίας ἀμφέθηκά σοι ('I put an olive crown on you [the baby Ion]'; Creusa added a gold necklace, *Ion* 1531). The implication may be that Moses' mother wanted to ensure that the baby was noticed and rescued. On the motif of the exposed child's dressing and accoutrements see Huys 1995, 201f., 206–9.

20. φαιδρῦναι, to cleanse: infinitive of purpose as commonly in Koinê Greek (Blass–Debrunner §390). For earlier examples with verbs of motion (as here) or presence (107) see Goodwin 1889, §772.

22. realised I was a Hebrew: the princess presumably thinks he has been hidden to save him from drowning. In *Exodus* 2.5 her pity explains why she disobeyed her father's order that he should be killed, and in Philo, *Moses* 1.15 she employs his mother as his nurse because she is afraid to take him directly into the palace.

30f. She named me Moses etc.: *Exodus* 2.10, 'She named him Moses saying, 'Because I took him up out of the water''. In *Exodus* this happens a few years later when she adopts the child and the explanation alludes to a supposed derivation from the Egyptian word for water, μῶυ (e.g. Philo, *Moses* 1.17, Josephus, *AJ* 2.228, *Ap.* 1.286; »» Thissen 2004). Ezechiel uses it loosely since in his narrative Moses was rescued from the river-bank, not the water.

To these things, after other things etc.: the sentence in the mss. looks like a statement of Alexander ('To these things after other things Ezechiel adds also about these things . . . '), but this is both awkward and questionable since Clement quotes lines 7–40 continuously with no indication that Ezechiel's text contained 'other things'. Jacobson (195 n. 34) and Lanfranchi (124f.) therefore follow a suggestion of Girardi 32 (cf. Kraus 1968, 165 n. 4) and attribute the first few words to Eusebius; the phrasing then matches the references to Alexander quoting Ezechiel at lines 68ff., 132ff. and 193ff. I think this is correct but suspect that a verb is missing rather than just implied in Alexander's statement. The **other things** added by Alexander would be some incidental explanation(s), perhaps including an etymology of Moses' name. Verses 32ff. then probably follow 31 immediately (so e.g. Lanfranchi 124f.), though some allow for a little about the mother's care for her child (e.g. Kuiper 244, Jacobson 77). The transition is abrupt, but it is even more abrupt in *Exodus* 2.10–11 where the narrative skips from the naming of Moses to his setting forth from the palace 'when he was grown up' (μέγας γενόμενος).

32–58. Moses' education; events leading to his exile. An expansion of *Exodus* 2.11–15, adding that Moses received both a Jewish and an Egyptian education (32–38). Clement skates over the murder episode, replacing 40–50 (πρὸς ἔργα–λέγω) with a paraphrase (which P. Oxy. omits): 'Then after relating the fight between the Hebrew and the Egyptian and the burial of the Egyptian in the sand he speaks about the other fight as follows'.

34–35. telling me all our history etc.: μυθεύσασα implies an established oral history, λέξασα telling the facts in detail. The gifts are those granted in God's covenant with the patriarchs of the Jewish nation (see below on 106).

37–38. with royal nurture and education etc.: thus Moses was educated as a future ruler of Egypt, an expectation he abandoned when he left the palace and was drawn towards his calling as a leader of the Jews. This is not in *Exodus* but is emphasized in other biblical sources (*Jubilees* 47.5*, Acts* 7.22) and vastly elaborated in Philo, *Moses* 1.20–24 where Moses has teachers from all over the civilized world and rapidly surpasses them all, yet sees true knowledge as that of his forefathers. In Josephus, *AJ* 2.236f. his education incurs envy and suspicion from the Egyptians. **as if I was her own offspring: ὡς ἀπὸ σπλάγχνων ἐῶν** is lit. 'as from her own womb' (σπλάγχνα 'innards' used poetically for the womb, »» LSJ 'σπλάγχνον' I.2). **[**Possessive ἑός is familiar from epic, Pindar and Alexandrian poetry but unknown in Attic authors except (probably) Aesch. *Pers.* 13. Possessive ὅς is almost as rare in tragedy.**]**

39. a full *cycle?* of days: ms. κόλπος ('fold', 'cavity') makes no sense and κόλτος is meaningless. For Kuiper's κύκλος, ***cycle*** cf. Eur. *Or.* 1645 ἐνιαυτοῦ κύκλον 'the cycle of a year', *Hel.* 112 ἑπτὰ καρπίμους κύκλους 'seven harvest-cycles'. Note also *Acts* 7.23 ὡς δὲ ἐπληροῦτο αὐτῷ τεσσαρακονταετὴς χρόνος 'when a period of forty years was completed for him (Moses)', *Levit.* 25.29 ἕως πληρωθῇ ἐνιαυτὸς ἡμερῶν 'until a year of days is completed', *Luke* 2.6 ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν, 'the days for her giving birth were completed'.

40–41. the works the king had devised: lit. 'the king's works and devising', a hendiadys. LSJ misrepresents **τέχνασμα** here as 'artifice, trick', i.e. the king's plotting against the Jews, and Holladay mistranslates **θυμός μ' ἄνωγε** ('my spirit alerted me to the works and wiles of the king'; similarly Lanfranchi). θυμὸς ἄνωγε (-ει, -η, -οι) is an epic formula (*Iliad* 19x). The **ἔργα** Moses wants to see are the building projects of *Exodus* 1.11–14, 2.23, 5.5 etc. where his fellow Israelites are working; cf. *Exodus* 2.11, 'Moses set out towards his brothers, the sons of Israel. And after observing their toil . . . '); similarly *Acts* 7.23f.

42–43. who had come to blows: lit. 'in deployments of hands' (cf. LSJ 'χείρ' II.4.d). **[ὃν** (for mss. unmetrical τὸν): Ezechiel uses ὅς as a demonstrative in μέν–δέ combinations here and in 240, not unusually (LSJ 'ὅς ἥ, ὅ' A.II.4, Gildersleeve 1911, §522); more loosely in 45 and 136.**]**

49–54. and these ones kinsmen: lit. 'and them specifically (**μάλιστα**) kinsmen', cf. 71–72 n. Jacobson 79–80 notes that, unlike *Exodus* and other accounts,

Ezechiel does not identify the Egyptian as the aggressor in the first fight or the kinsmen in the second as Israelites; he finds the first point inexplicable and sees the second as designed to avoid describing Jews fighting amongst themselves to a non-Jewish audience. Like Lanfranchi (138–40) I think Ezechiel took both details for granted. **I rescued my brother** implies that the Israelite needed help, and Moses would hardly have intervened in a fight between two Egyptians. **kinsmen** presumably means kinsmen of Moses as well as each other. **someone weaker than yourself** differs from *Exodus* 2.13 'your neighbour' (τὸν πλησίον), emphasizing Moses' role as defender of the weak and oppressed (Kraus 1968, 174). In *Acts* 7.26–35 Stephen interprets the intervention as foreshadowing Moses' future leadership: 'You are brothers; why do you wrong each other?' Similarly the Israelite's response here, **Who sent you here to be our judge etc.?**

55. all of this was soon reported: the mss. have πάντα . . . ἀπήγγειλεν, 'he soon reported all of this', but an Israelite would hardly have made such a report and *Exodus* 2.15 has simply 'Pharaoh heard this report'. Kuiper's impersonal **ἀπηγγέλη** is more apt than Strugnell's ἀπήγγειλαν, 'they reported'.

59. But I see seven maidens here: this begins a transition to a dialogue scene which dramatized the meeting of Moses with Sepphora (*Exodus* 2.16 says simply that the sisters came to draw water at the well where Moses was resting). Alexander probably did not omit any of Ezechiel's text here. As Lanfranchi 127f. notes, the statements introduced by **εἶτα** at lines 96 and 115 do not indicate breaks in the text, while those after lines 65, 112, 253 do so but also make the breaks clear. Moses' remark will have been followed by further comments covering the maidens' entry and then by his address to them which Sepphora answers in lines 60–65.

60–65. Moses and Sepphora

Sepphora informs Moses that he has arrived in Libya, a land inhabited by many tribes of Ethiopians under a single monarch, and that the local *polis* is governed by a priest who is her father. This encounter follows a narrative model, frequent in tragedy, in which a wandering hero finds himself in an unknown land and meets someone who answers his enquiries about it. Commentators compare *Od.* 6.195ff. (Nausicaa finding Odysseus on the shore of Ogygia, 'Phaeacians possess this city and land, and I am the daughter of great-hearted Alcinous, who governs the Phaeacians' might and power'), Soph. *Mysians* F 411 (Telephus arriving in Mysia, 'The whole land is called Asia, stranger, and the Mysians' *polis* is called Mysia'); cf. also Eur. *Meleager* F 515 ('This land is Calydon . . . and Oeneus rules over this Aetolian land . . . '). The royally educated Moses hardly needs such information, but the device serves to establish the dramatic context and locate the current action in a remote and exotic area that is not Egypt. Sepphora's sisters might have been the play's chorus if there was one, but that is unknown (above, p. 314).

In *Exodus* 2.15f. Moses arrives in Midian (Madiam in the Septuagint text) where his future wife's father is the local priest and owns livestock. The father's name is Raguel (Ραγουηλ) in *Exodus* 2.18 (also *Numbers* 12.1) but later Jethro (Ιοθορ: *Exod.* 3.1, 4.18, 18.1–14, *Judges* 1.16);[34] Alexander calls him Raguel, and Ezechiel presumably did so or perhaps did not name him at all. He certainly gives Moses' future wife her usual name, Sepphora (Zipporah) as in *Exodus* 2.21 and elsewhere. Midian was the region south of Canaan in what is now NW Saudi Arabia (east of the Gulf of Aqaba and the Red Sea), supposedly settled by Midian, one of Abraham's sons by his second wife Keturah (cf. *Genesis* 25.1–4). Greek texts however identify the place of Moses' refuge differently. Artapanus and Philo say only that he fled to Arabia, meaning apparently Egyptian Arabia, the area between the Nile and the Red Sea and Gulf of Suez.[35] Demetrius and Josephus name Midian but describe it as a city on the Red Sea coast founded by Midian and populated by his descendants.[36] Jacobson and Lanfranchi argue that they place this city on the west coast of the Red Sea, i.e. in Africa, and thus allow for a population of Ethiopians; if so, their location is at least loosely similar to Ezechiel's which also mentions a *polis*. Commentators generally assume that Ezechiel identified this *polis* as Madiam/Midian, but in a dramatic text there was no need for him to name it and the fact that Alexander does not do so while Sepphora refers only to 'this *polis*' (64) suggests that he did not name it. She perhaps named only 'Libya' and 'Ethiopians' (a general term for black Africans, especially those of southern Egypt and Nubia), thus leaving the location conveniently vague. The Ethiopian location seems to have served to identify Sepphora with the Ethiopian wife of Moses about whom Mariam and Aaron complain in *Numbers* 12.1, and thus to avoid the implication that Moses married bigamously. On all this see especially Jacobson 85–87, Lanfranchi 151–56.

Sepphora says that the whole land of Libya has **just one ruler . . . both monarch and army commander** (62f.). This has no evident dramatic relevance and is often misinterpreted as referring to Raguel (e.g. Jacobson 12, 55, Ruffatto

---

[34] The name is a secondary addition in *Exodus* 3.16 (Wevers 1990, 20; 1992, 239f.). The dual names were variously explained by Jewish commentators and are elaborately allegorized (along with Midian, the 7 daughters, the dispute at the well and the care of the flocks) by Philo, *On changes of names* 103–120. Demetrius in the note quoted by Alexander after lines 66–67 (Eusebius, *PE* 9.29.4) makes Raguel Sepphora's grandfather and Iothor her father.

[35] In Artapanus Moses escapes from Memphis into Arabia (Euseb. *PE* 9.27.17–19) and later the Israelites cross Arabia to reach the Red Sea (9.27.34). In Philo, *Moses* 1.47 he escapes 'into the neighbouring Arabia' (εἰς τὴν ὅμορον Ἀραβίαν). For Egyptian Arabia see Strabo 17.1.21 and 30: »» Lanfranchi 152f.; Gmirkin 2006, 223.

[36] Demetrius in Euseb. *PE* 9.29.1–3; Josephus, *AJ* 2.257.

2008, Keddie–MacLellan 2017, 182 with n. 49). Raguel is a priest as in *Exodus* 2.16 but here dignified as **governing this community (πόλεως) and giving judgment to men**. The word *polis* need not imply a city; Ezechiel may have had in mind a country town or large village with a rural economy (note Raguel's flocks; Beelzephon is a *polis,* 216). It could easily include the surrounding area: cf. Strabo 8.3.31 (see Critias? **F 16** in Vol. 1) and Soph. F 411 cited above.

Then after telling about the watering of the livestock etc.: in *Exodus* 2.17–21 Sepphora and her sisters come to the well to draw water for their flock but are driven off by some rival shepherds; Moses rescues them and helps them water the flock; they return home and their father hearing of this tells them to invite him to eat with them; Moses then stays with the family and receives Sepphora as his wife. How Ezechiel dramatized this sequence and in particular the shepherds' assault can only be guessed. Alexander's summary implies that Moses has met the girls before the shepherds arrive, whereas *Exodus* 2.17 suggests that he introduced himself after driving them off (cf. Lanfranchi 162).

66–67. Sepphora and Choum

The dramatic context of this excerpt can again only be guessed since it corresponds with nothing in the biblical story or anywhere else. The name **Choum** is found elsewhere only as a son of Canaan and ancestor of the Ethiopians (Eupolemus quoted by Alexander Polyhistor in Euseb. *PE* 9.17.9). That figure is otherwise Chous (i.e. Kush) son of Ham (*Genesis* 10.6), and it may well be that Χούμ should be read as Χούν, accusative of Χούς both in Eupolemus (where it is actually the reading in some mss.) and in Ezechiel (where it is preferred by Snell and Lanfranchi). Either way the name here seems to belong to an invented 'Ethiopian' character who has some connection with Sepphora and her family. He has been identified as someone objecting to Sepphora's marriage with an outsider, either a brother (e.g. Kuiper 247; 1904, 92–94) or a disappointed suitor (Stephanus below, Girardi 33, Jacobson). Jacobson 198 n. 9 suggests the dispute might have led to a revelation that Moses and Sepphora were in fact related through their joint descent from Abraham, as in the genealogy of Demetrius which Alexander quotes after this excerpt. »» Jacobson 1981c, Lanfranchi 163–69 and 2007a.

Stephanus assigned both these verses to Choum, punctuating after **ξένῳ**: 'Still, you must declare this to the stranger (i.e. Moses): 'My father has given me to this man (i.e. to me, Choum)'. This would clearly make him a suitor, but it makes contorted Greek and contradicts Alexander (**Choum and Sepphora in dialogue**) and is now generally rejected (»» Lanfranchi 164f.). **τῷδ(ε), this** does not necessarily mean that Moses was present during this dialogue as Lanfranchi (164f.) and others assert. ὅδε often refers to people not physically present, e.g. 193, Eur. *Andr.* 967, *Iph. Taur.* 558, *Hel.* 100 (»» Kannicht on *Helen* 324–6).

68–89. Moses' dream

The scene has no biblical precedent. Ezechiel was presumably imitating the use of dreams in classical tragedy, although those are typically more complex as characters misinterpret their dreams (Hecuba in Eur. *Hec.* 79ff., Iphigenia in *Iph.Taur.* 42ff.) or hope vainly to escape a predicted outcome (the Queen in Aesch. *Pers.* 176ff., Clytemnestra in Aesch. *Cho*. 32ff. and Soph. *El*. 405ff., 644ff.) and the truth of the dream emerges dynamically within the drama. The dream stories in Herodotus (noted by Jacobson 96f. as a likely influence on Ezechiel) play similarly on mistaken interpretations or neglected true ones (e.g. Croesus in Hdt. 1.34ff., Astyages 1.107f., Cyrus 1.209f.). In Ezechiel's play the dream is instantly and accurately interpreted by Raguel as foretelling an important future for Moses, a function which in classic tragedies is often performed by gods speaking *ex machina* at the end of a play (cf. Snell 1971, 179f.). In substance Moses' dream is closer to those of biblical figures foretelling or guiding their future greatness (Joseph in *Genesis* 37, Solomon conversing with Yahweh in *I Kings* 3).

In his dream Moses approaches **a great throne** reaching into the heavens from the peaks of Mount Sinai; on it sits **a noble man** holding a **diadem and a great sceptre** (symbols of royalty) which he gives to Moses, seating him on the throne in his place. Moses now surveys the entire cosmos (**all the encircled earth etc.**) and a **multitude of stars** falls before him; he counts the stars, and they march past him in a kind of military review. The setting of the dream anticipates Moses' meeting with God on Mount Sinai when he received God's law and was instructed to communicate it to the Jewish people (*Exodus* 19–24). In Jewish belief God's throne was normally located in the heavens, but in *Exodus* 24.10 the 'sapphire paving' seen beneath God's feet on Mount Sinai could be interpreted as referring to it, and this may have influenced Ezechiel's conception (Jacobson 90 and 1981b, 276f., Lanfranchi 186–89). The **noble man** must be understood as God himself (Jacobson 1981b, 278f., Lanfranchi 194–96) rather than an angelic intermediary (van der Horst 1984, 364f.); God cannot be seen in his real form (cf. 101–3) but he may choose to appear in human guise (99 n.). Thus God himself invests Moses with the symbols of royalty and allows him to sit on his throne and exercise the divine privileges of surveying the cosmos and receiving the acclamation of the stars (79–81 n.).

Raguel's interpretation of the dream amounts to 'a prophecy of Moses' future deeds and greatness' (Jacobson 94), although Raguel only grasps these in general terms.[37] Lanfranchi notes that his response is typical of ancient dream-interpretations, translating each detail of the dream to an earthly level:

[37] See the full discussions of Jacobson 89–97 and 1981b, 272–79.

> He starts his interpretation with the enthronement of Moses as the promise of terrestrial βασιλεία . . . and continues by stating that Moses' contemplation of the cosmos is a sign of his mission as a prophet . . . The installation of Moses on the heavenly throne and gift of the scepter and diadem mean that he will be king on earth and judge of men, who in the dream are represented by the stars.[38]

The stars falling before Moses thus resemble the Sun, Moon and eleven stars bowing before Joseph in his dream (*Genesis* 37.9), the reviewing of the stars anticipates Moses' census of the Israelites in the wilderness of Sinai (*Numbers* 1), and his appointment as judge anticipates *Exodus* 18.13–27 where Raguel finds him delivering judgments and advises him to judge only the most important ones himself. The attribution of kingship contradicts the biblical conception of Moses and is probably due to his reinvention in the Hellenistic period as a king invested with God's authority, superior to earthly kings and instrumental in making God's law known to the world.[39]

Moses' dream-vision has been compared with the prophet Ezechiel's far more elaborate vision of the heavenly throne (*Ezechiel* 1) and with the revelatory visions of the throne (the *merkavah*) and the cosmos which it inspired in Jewish apocalyptic literature. The main figure in these is Enoch, great-grandfather of Noah, who according to *Genesis* 5.24 'walked with God' and was taken by him from the earth. In the *Book of the Watchers* (a part of the *Book of Enoch* probably from the third century BC) Enoch is carried into the heaven, sees God enthroned in splendour with his entourage and surveys the heavens and the sources of all natural phenomena (*1Enoch* 14–19). In the *Third Book of Enoch* (perhaps originating in the second century AD) God gives Enoch a throne like his own with royal accoutrements and rule over all kingdoms and heavenly beings, and reveals to him all the mysteries of heaven and earth with knowledge of past, present and future. Philo credited Moses himself with divine status and rule over the natural world and knowledge of the mysteries of the cosmos granted to him by God (*Moses* 1.155–58, early first C. AD), apparently reflecting a movement to assert Moses' authority as superior to Enoch's. Van der Horst (1983, cf. 1984, 364f.) infers that Ezechiel formulated Moses' dream as a vision of this kind, foretelling his virtual deification as an angelic mediator between

---

[38] Lanfranchi 2007b, 56f., cf. 2006, 197–99.

[39] The kingdom of God is contrasted similarly with earthly kingdoms in Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, *Daniel* 2.31–45 (see below on 85f.). Trencsényi-Waldapfel 156: 'La domination œcuménique de Moïse ne peut signifier autre chose que l'acceptation par le monde entier de la loi divine, révélée par lui'. Moro 2011 notes that the story as told by Ezechiel, Artapanus and Josephus defines Moses as the legitimate heir of Pharaonic kingship.

God and the world.[40] This goes beyond Raguel's interpretation (which treats the dream as a dream rather than an apocalyptic experience and relates its details symbolically to Moses' future human career) and suggests a further allegorical interpretation of which neither Raguel nor Moses could be aware. The case for an apocalyptic interpretation is considered sceptically by Jacobson (94f., 1981b, 273–87) and Lanfranchi (184–86, 189–91 and 2007b), accepted by J. Collins 2000, 224–28, Oegema 2002, 41 and others.[41]

68. on the peaks of Mount Sinai: the transmitted text is corrupt but plausibly restored by Dübner.

69. οὐρανοῦ πτυχάς, heaven's folds: a poeticism as in Eur. *Pho.* 84, cf. *Hel.* 605, *Phaethon* F 779.7 αἰθέρος πτυχάς, *Hel.* 44 ἐν πτυχαῖσιν αἰθέρος, *Or.* 1636 ἐν αἰθέρος πτυχαῖς. **[**For the accentuation, Mastronarde on *Pho.* 84.**]**

70. φῶτα γενναῖον, a noble man: the word φώς is poetic and almost confined to epic and tragedy. Lanfranchi notes the juxatposition with γενναῖος in Eur. *Alc.* 859f. οὐκ ἐρεῖ κακὸν | εὐεργετῆσαι φῶτα, γενναῖος γεγώς ('you won't say it's a base man you've treated well, noble as you are'). It is hard not to sense a hint of φῶς (< φάος) = 'light', which in biblical texts is often the life-giving light of God. **[ἐν τῷ, on which:** article as relative pronoun, cf. 103; this is not uncommon in epic, Ionic poetry and tragedy (»» LSJ 'ὁ, ἡ, τό' C) though rare in Euripidean dialogue (*Andr.* 810, *El.* 279, *Bacch.* 712).

72. μάλιστα, lit. 'mostly', is here 'specifically', contrasting the left hand with the right hand with which he gestures.

77–78. all the encircled earth supposes a flat earth with underworld below and heavens above, perhaps encircled by Ocean as in older Greek belief; a spherical earth would not suit the imagery here. **[**Münscher's τά τ' ἔνερθε, 'and the things below the earth', makes the sentence a little more coherent (cf. 88).**]**

79–81. and a multitude of stars etc.: the stars fall before Moses, he counts them and they march past him in a kind of military review. In biblical terms these are again privileges of God: *Psalm* 147.4 'He who counts the multitudes of stars and gives them all names' (cf. *Isaiah* 40.26); *Nehemiah* 9.6 'the hosts of the

---

[40] Van der Horst 1983, 29: '[Ezechiel] was not interested in merkavah-mysticism in itself. But he did see that the literary form of a merkavah vision was quite suitable as a medium for expressing a notion of more importance to him: namely that Moses is God's viceregent, that the man who liberated the people of Israel from the Egyptians is not merely a personage from the distant past but still present and ruling over the universe, and that through his heavenly enthronement the nation of the Jews is validated as divinely established.' »» Meeks 1968 on the deification of Moses during his ascent of Mt. Sinai in Jewish exegesis.

[41] The apocalyptic interpretation can be taken to absurd lengths. Ruffatto (2006, 2008) and Orlov (2008) propose to redefine Raguel as an angel possessing 'interpretive omniscience' (Orlov 189) and his interpretation as part of Moses' dream.

heavens prostrate themselves before you'; »» Lanfranchi 196, cf. van der Horst 1984, 368. Jacobson 92 compares God's challenge to Abraham to count the stars in *Genesis* 15.5f., but there God is simply assuring Abraham that his descendants will be innumerable, cf. *Exodus* 32.13, *Deuteronomy* 10.22.

83. ὦ ξένε, O stranger: Raguel is by now Moses' father-in-law (see Alexander's introductory comments) but still calls him a ξένος. In *Exodus* 2.22 Moses names his first son Gershom 'because I am a settler (πάροικος, Hebrew *gêr*)' in an alien land'.

85f. Surely you will raise up etc.: an 'apodeictic question' making a confident assertion, e.g. Eur. *Alc*. 771f. ἆρα τὸν ξένον στυγῶ δικαίως;, 'Do I detest the stranger justly (of course I do)?' (»» Mastronarde 1979, 8f.). **γε** adds emphasis (Denniston 1954, 50). The sense of **ἐξαναστήσεις θρόνον** is illustrated by *2Samuel* 3.10 ὤμοσεν κύριος τῷ Δαυιδ . . . τοῦ ἀναστῆσαι τὸν θρόνον Δαυιδ ἐπὶ Ισραηλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ιουδαν, 'the Lord swore to David . . . to raise up the throne of David over Israel and Judah'; *1Kings* 9.5, ἀναστήσω τὸν θρόνον τῆς βασιλείας σου ἐπὶ Ισραηλ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 'I shall raise up your [Solomon's] throne over Israel for ever'; *Daniel* 2.44 ἀναστήσει ὁ θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ βασιλείαν, ἥτις εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας οὐ διαφθαρήσεται, 'The God of heaven will raise up a kingdom which will be for ever undestroyed'. It does not mean 'uproot/destroy a throne' (Kuiper *et al.*), nor 'upset a great man (i.e. the Pharaoh) from his throne' (θρόνου conj. Stählin, accepted by e.g. Snell, Stewart 250f. n. 68). Correctly Jacobson 93f., Lanfranchi 178. **[**ἐξανίστημι in classical Greek normally means 'raise from a seated position etc.' or 'uproot, remove, destroy' but in the Septuagint occasionally 'set up, establish' (*Genesis* 4.25, 19.34, *Isaiah* 61.4), as ἀνίστημι commonly does.**]**

88. and the realms below etc.: see above on 77–78.

89. you shall see what is and what was before etc.: a conventional characterization of seers such as Calchas (*Iliad* 1.69f.) who have access to divine knowledge (cf. the Muses in Hes. *Theog.* 38, West on *Theog*. 32). For Moses as a seer see Jacobson 94f., Holladay 450f.

90–174. Moses converses with God in the Burning Bush

These excerpts comprise substantial parts of a dramatic scene including Moses' encounter with God in the burning bush and God's appointment of Moses as his spokesman (90–112), Moses' reluctance overcome by God's promise of Aaron's assistance and gift of magical powers (113–31), God's prediction of the plagues which will eventually compel the Pharaoh to release the Israelites (132–51), his instructions for the decisive night when he will kill all the Egyptians' firstborn while sparing the Israelites, and the night's perpetual commemoration in the feast of the Passover (152–74). The encounter itself (90–131) is adapted from *Exodus* 3.1–4.17 with some abridgement (van Ruiten 2006 provides a point-by-point comparison). The remainder draws on the far more detailed accounts of the

plagues and Passover instructions in *Exodus* 7.14–12.36. In *Exodus* there is a substantial time-lapse covered by only four verses (2.22–25) between Moses' marriage to Sepphora and his encounter with God, and the encounter takes place as Moses is tending his father-in-law's flocks on Mount Horeb (3.1). It is not clear how Ezechiel handled the time-lapse and change of scene, nor whether he included any intervening events besides the dream. The minimum requirements would be a briefly empty stage (with or without a choral interlude) and a few scene-setting verses preceding line 90.

Moses' reactions to the burning bush and God's voice (**90–112**) are closely modelled on *Exodus* 3.2–10, with several direct verbal echoes, e.g. *Exod.* 3.2 ὁ βάτος καίεται πυρί ~ **92 βάτος μὲν καίεται πολλῷ πυρί**, 3.3 παρελθὼν ὄψομαι τὸ ὅραμα τὸ μέγα τοῦτο ~ **94f. προελθὼν ὄψομαι τεράστιον μέγιστον**, 3.6 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρός σου, θεὸς Αβρααμ etc. ~ **104f. ἐγὼ θεὸς σῶν . . . γεννητόρων, Ἀβραάμ τε etc.** The subsequent dialogue (**113–31**) is adapted from *Exodus* 4.2–17, with many echoes of the biblical text (see further below on 120–131). There is also some simplification (unless Alexander quoted these extracts out of their proper order). In *Exodus* Moses' magical powers are to be a means of convincing the Israelites that he has really talked with God (4.1–9 ~ **120–31**), and when Moses objects that he cannot speak well God designates Aaron to do his speaking for him (4.10–17 ~ **113–19**). Ezechiel minimizes Moses' reluctance, which is rather marked in the *Exodus* narrative.

There is no break in Ezechiel's text after line 95 where Alexander's comment serves only to mark the change of speaker. His comment after line 112 shows that he omitted 'some dialogue' at this point, perhaps God's instruction that he should be known to the Israelites as Yahweh (*Exod.* 3.13–15) and/or further details of his messages to the Israelites and the Pharaoh (cf. *Exod.* 3.16–22). There is again no break after line 115, and perhaps none after 119 where Alexander's comment may simply draw attention to the new topic.

The early parts of this scene suggest that the play was composed for some kind of performance. Lines 90–104 and 120–131 at least read *as if* they were designed to accompany step-by-step stage action (cf. above, p. 318 with n. 22). If they were, how were the actions represented on the stage? The question is unanswerable in any detail, but we could reasonably assume an offstage divine voice like the voice of Dionysus at Eur. *Bacchae* 567–603 (accompanying an earthquake!) and some visual rather than mere verbal representation of the burning bush and the miracles (»» Fountoulakis 1995–96). It is not so easy to imagine the scene being designed for a regular Greek theatre, not because of any staging difficulties but because a large mixed audience is unlikely to have appreciated a scene in which a lone character listens to lengthy speeches pronounced by an invisible god.

97. the sandals from your feet: lit. 'the binding of your feet'. **98. The ground you are standing on: ἧς σὺ γῆς ἐφέστηκας** is lit. 'On what ground you

are standing' (simplified unmetrically in the mss. of Eusebius). **99. the word of God:** i.e. the voice of God himself communicating at the human level, as is clear from what follows (»» Lanfranchi 212–15, refs. in Holladay 455f.). Similarly in *Exodus* 3.2 the ἄγγελος κυρίου, 'messenger/angel of the Lord' is God appearing in human form as in *Genesis* 16.7–13, 21.17–19, *Exod.* 14.19 (with 13.21f.). See also below on 156–59. **shines out:** the word was used of sounds as well as sights (»» LSJ 'λάμπω' 2, 'ἐκλάμπω' I.1, 'λαμπρός' I.4 including some tragic precedents) and is especially apt in connection with the burning bush.

100. Take courage, my son: God notices Moses' dismay and addresses him in more familiar and reassuring terms than in line 95. **[**The aorist **θάρσησον** is found only here, in **adesp. F 649**.1 (p. 374 below, also **θάρσησον, ὦ παῖ**), LXX *Judith* 11.1 and a few times in later, mostly Christian writers. The common θάρσει ('be of good courage', Attic θάρρει) appears 48 times in tragedy alone.**]**

103. which I have come to tell you: τῶν ἕκατ' ἐλήλυθα is lit. 'for the sake of which I have come' (article as relative pronoun: 70 n.). **104. those you call (λέγεις) your ancestors:** cf. LSJ 'λέγω' III.4. **[105. Ἀβραάμ τε καὶ Ἰσαὰκ etc.:** Snell 1966, 28 suggests scanning both names as ⏑ ⏑ – and **Ἰακώβου** as either ⏑ – – – as in line 1 or ⏑⏑ – – , hence the whole verse as ⏑⏑ – | ⏑ ⏑⏑ | ⏑ – || ⏑⏑ – (or ⏑ ⏑⏑) | – – | ⏑ – . Either way makes a mid-line diaeresis. For the phrasing cf. especially Aesch. *Pers.* 308 Λίλαιος Ἀρσάμης τε κἈργήστης τρίτος, 313 Ἀρκτεὺς Ἀδεύης καὶ Φερεσσεύης τρίτος.**]**

106. I have remembered them and my gifts to them: i.e. the gifts bestowed by God in his covenant with the patriarchs of the Jewish nation (*Genesis* 15.18 etc.), as also in line 35; cf. *Exodus* 2.24 'God remembered his covenant with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob', 6.4f. 'I established my covenant with them so as to give them the land of the Canaanites . . . and I have remembered my covenant with you' (»» Horbury 1986/2003, Lanfranchi 208f. against the objections of Jacobson 109–11. Horbury notes that the biblical verses recording God's covenant were amongst the 'remembrance verses' later recited in Jewish liturgy and may have been already specially marked in Ezechiel's time.)

107. πάρειμι σῶσαι, I am here to rescue: infinitive of purpose (20 n.).

112. that you should lead: ὅπως with optative **ἐξάγοις** expressing an indirect command: »» Goodwin 1889, 128.

113–14. not good with words . . . weak-voiced: εὔλογος, normally 'reasonable' or 'probable', here means 'eloquent'. **[**Ezechiel may have been influenced by the variant in *Exodus* 4.10, οὐχ ἱκανός (v.l. εὔλογος) εἰμι . . . ἰσχνόφωνος καὶ βραδύγλωσσος ἐγώ εἰμι, which is reflected in Philo, *Moses* 1.83 ἰσχνόφωνον καὶ βραδύγλωσσον, οὐκ εὔλογον: »» van der Horst 1984, 369f., Lanfranchi 210.**]**

116–19. I will send Aaron . . . to whom you shall tell everything that I have said etc.: *Exodus* 4.14–16, 'he (Aaron) will come out to meet you . . . and you shall speak to him and give my words into his mouth (ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ

δώσεις τὰ ῥήματά μου εἰς τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ) . . . and he shall be your mouth, and you shall be for him his communication with the god (αὐτὸς ἔσται σου στόμα, σὺ δὲ αὐτῷ ἔσῃ τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν)'. **he shall speak before the king:** in *Exodus* 4.16 Aaron is to deliver God's message to the Hebrews, but in the summary at 6.26–7.2 he is to address the Pharaoh as well. **you conversing with me and he receiving from you:** God puts his words into Moses' mouth, and Moses puts them into Aaron's mouth; cf. *Exodus* 7.1 δέδωκά σε θεὸν Φαραω, καὶ Ααρων ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἔσται σου προφήτης, 'I have given you as a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron your brother shall be your prophet'. **[118. αὐτός**, a distinctive **he** rather than 'he himself', is common in the Septuagint and Koinê Greek, e.g. in *Exod.* 4.16 above; Blass–Debrunner §277**]**

120–31. The text of *Exodus* 4.2–7 is reflected throughout with its narrative comments incorporated in the dramatic dialogue; thus 'He threw it on the ground and it became a serpent, and Moses fled from it' becomes **. . . retire quickly. It will be a fearsome serpent. — There, it is thrown – O lord, be merciful etc.** On the staging of the miracles see above, 90–174 n.

130. just like snow: 'leprous, like snow' in the Masoretic text. The Septuagint translators (and some other sources) elided the reference to leprosy, probably to avoid a widespread accusation that the Jews in Egypt were lepers banished from their own land (»» Jacobson 106f.).

Alexander's **intervening comments** perhaps mentioned the third 'sign' (σημεῖον) which God gives to Moses as a backup in *Exodus* 4.9: he should pour river-water on the ground and it will turn to blood. Moses actually does this in Josephus's version of the Burning Bush episode, *AJ* 2.273, and Jacobson 104 argues that it must have been at least mentioned if not performed in Ezechiel's scene since Alexander's comment before line 120 speaks of 'the staff and the other prodigies'. More certainly, Alexander will have included an explanation of how the staff was to be used by Moses and Aaron in initiating the plagues, paraphrased from *Exodus* and/or quoted from another source such as Demetrius, before quoting Ezechiel's poetic account (**Ezechiel too says these things . . .**). It looks as if Ezechiel again omitted the use of the miracles as 'signs' to convince the sceptical Israelites (*Exodus* 4.8f., 17, 30). If so, not much of his text is missing between lines 131 and 132.

132–51. The plagues. In *Exodus* God foretells the plagues to Moses briefly and without description (3.19, 4.21–23). Since they could not be staged effectively, Ezechiel condenses the subsequent narrative of the plagues (*Exod.* 7.14–11.10, 12.29f.) into a vivid prediction addressed to Moses within the burning bush episode. This naturally excludes all the repetitive details which enliven the *Exodus* narrative as a battle of wills and wits between Moses and the Pharaoh, as well as the role of Aaron and God's exemptions of the Israelites which are prominent throughout it. The plagues are identical with those of *Exodus* but in a

slightly different order (ash-induced sores precede dogflies and livestock plague, 136–41; locusts follow the three-day darkness, 144–46); this nevertheless preserves *Exodus*'s arrangement of the first nine plagues in three groups of three (Lanfranchi 246 tabulates the sequences in *Exodus*, Ezechiel and other sources). The groups are punctuated in Ezechiel's speech (133 **πρῶτον**, 136 **ἔπειτα**, 141 turning to the heavens, 147 **ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις**). Condemnations follow the sixth plague (**those will die whose hearts are hard within them**, 140f.) and the last (**I will end the abuses of these evil men**, 148). On the description of the plagues in general see Jacobson 112–21, Lanfranchi 234–37.

132. ἐν τῇδε ῥάβδῳ, With this staff: cf. *Exodus* 4.17 τὴν ῥάβδον ταύτην . . . ἐν ᾗ ποιήσεις ἐν αὐτῇ τὰ σημεῖα , 'this staff . . . with which you will perform with it the signs'. **[ἐν, with:** cf. 9 n.**]**

133. the river (i.e. the Nile) **will flow blood: ποτάμιον** seems to be a noun (the -ιον suffix increasingly lost its diminutive force in Hellenistic Greek); less probably an adjective with ὕδωρ understood ('the river-water', cf. Philo, *Life of Moses* 1.81 τοῦ ποταμίου ὕδατος): »» Lanfranchi 221f. In *Exodus* the water in the river 'will change into blood' (μεταβαλεῖ εἰς αἷμα, 7.17) and Aaron will separately transform all the other waters of Egypt; similarly Philo 1.99, although there Aaron transforms both 'the river' and all the other waters.

134. and all the streams etc.: perhaps the model for *TrGF* adesp. F 617.8 καὶ πᾶσα πηγὴ καὶ ὕδατος συστήματα. **ὑδάτων συστήματα** are standing waters (lakes, reservoirs etc.), cf. *Exodus* 4.19 πᾶν συνεστηκὸς ὕδωρ (but in *Genesis* 1.10 God names τὰ συστήματα τῶν ὑδάτων 'sea'). **[**F 617 is a Hellenistic Jewish forgery attributed to Aeschylus by Clement, *Strom.* 5.14.131.2 and others. Sutton (1987, 37) proposed to ascribe it to Ezechiel in part because of the similarity noted above, but line 8 looks more like a clumsy imitation ('every stream and bodies of water'). Sutton's other arguments are uncompelling. In line 11 ἐπὰν ἐπιβλέψῃ does not 'present a word-division following the second element of a tribrachic resolution': the α of ἐπάν is long and the phrase makes a second-foot anapaest contrary to Ezechiel's practice (Snell 1966, 25–29). Not much can be built on the use of the word παρεμφερής in line 216 and adesp. F 617.5 since it is fairly common in Hellenistic texts.**]**

135. the mosquito(?): σκνίψ denotes a variety of small biting insects. The malaria-bearing mosquito suits this context (cf. *Exodus* 8.16: »» van der Horst 1984, 370, Lanfranchi 222f.). **[**Strugnell 1967, 451 n. 6 adjusted the unmetrical καὶ σκνῖπας; the collective σκνῖπα may have caused confusion, but cf. *Exodus* 8.2 ὁ βάτραχος, 8.20 etc. ἡ κυνόμυια, 10.4 etc. ἡ ἀκρίς. Snell's lacuna after **πλῆθος** seems unneeded.**]**

136. I will scatter furnace-ashes: in *Exodus* 9.8f. Moses throws the ashes into the air and they become a dust afflicting humans and livestock throughout Egypt. **οἷς, on them:** see 43 n.

140–41. those will die etc.: in *Exodus* 9.1–7 the pestilence kills the Egyptians' livestock, not themselves. Jacobson 117f. suggests that Ezechiel wanted to amplify the impact of the deaths and the justice of God's actions here as well as in the tenth plague. **hearts . . . hard within them:** the Pharaoh repeatedly 'hardens his heart' (etc.) in the *Exodus* narrative.

141. πικράνω, I will harshen: aorist subjunctive expressing intention (not the unmetrical future indicative πικρᾰνῶ) as often in Homer (Goodwin 1889, 97) and sometimes in the Septuagint and New Testament (»» Mras 1944, 229; Blass–Debrunner §363). **[**Lanfranchi supposes a future πικρᾱνω, but his parallels are usually emended (Eur. *Bacch.* 528 πικραίνω Hermann, Ar. *Knights* 300 καὶ φανῶ σε Porson). The accentuation in the medieval manuscripts is of no value.**]**

149. king Pharaoh will heed none etc.: πείσετ(αι) is from πείθομαι (Kuiper *et al.*), not πάσχω 'suffer' (Kraus 1968, 174, Jacobson 119f.): cf. *Exodus* 11.9 οὐκ εἰσακούσεται ὑμῶν Φαραω, 'Pharaoh will not listen to you' (i.e. to your warning about the final plague). The Pharaoh does suffer from some of the earlier plagues (*Exodus* 8.4, 8.25).

152–74. God tells Moses how he must prepare the Israelites for the night when he will compel their release by killing all the firstborn of Egypt. They must make a sacrifice on the evening before the full moon of the current month, mark their houses to be spared by smearing sacrificial blood on doorposts and lintels, and eat all of the sacrificial meat, roasted, during the night. As they depart their women must collect valuables from the Egyptian women as compensation for the Israelites' years of slave labour. The month will become the first month of the Jewish year, and the event must be commemorated perpetually in what will become the Passover feast and by the sacrificing of firstborn domestic beasts. The speech reproduces the essentials of God's instructions to Moses and Aaron immediately before the killing of the Egyptians' firstborn in *Exodus* 12.2–20, repeating much of the biblical phrasing. It omits the rules that are more relevant to the future festival than the original Passover night (i.e. most of *Exodus* 12.3–5, 9–11, 15–20) and adds from elsewhere the instructions on compensation (162–66), an aition for the seven days of unleavened bread (168f.) and the requirement to sacrifice firstborn domestic beasts (172–74). See the notes below on all these points.

153. the first one of your years: i.e. the first month of all future years. *Exodus* 12.2, 'This month is for you the beginning of months (ἀρχὴ μηνῶν) . . . the first among the months of the year (πρῶτος . . . ἐν τοῖς μησὶν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ)'. The point is explained in 156–61 and confirmed at 192–94. The Passover normally begins on the night of the full moon following the spring equinox, the 15th day of the first month of the year (Nisan) in the Jewish calendar. With this declaration God establishes both the calendar and the date of the Passover. It also has the broader significance of establishing a new era (»» Jacobson 129, Lanfranchi 244f.) and perhaps of renewing time itself (Lanfranchi

ibid.). **[**Older editors changed **ἐνιαυτῶν** to ἐνιαυτοῦ with Stephanus, unnecessarily since God is talking about all future years (cf. **χρόνων**, 192); it is not a 'poetic plural' as Lanfranchi suggests.**]**

154. In this month I will lead my people away etc.: *Exodus* 12.17, 'On this day I will lead your force (τὴν δύναμιν ὑμῶν) out of the land of Egypt'. The Israelites' forty years of wandering in the wilderness are unmentioned in lines 154 and 167. Jacobson 134f. suggests that Ezechiel avoided advertising them to a non-Jewish audience, but the forty years are equally unanticipated in *Exodus* (12.17 above, 13.5, 13.11, 13.17). Most of the delay is caused later by the Israelites' own recalcitrance (*Numbers* 14.20–35).

156–60. You shall tell all the people: *Exodus* 12.3, 'Speak to all the gathering of the sons of Israel, saying . . . '. **διχομηνίᾳ (at the full moon)** is lit. 'at the month-division', i.e. half-way through the month (N. Collins 1991, 205). The term Pascha is introduced prematurely; in *Exodus* 12.11 God names it after prescribing the ritual, as here in line 184.

to make the Pascha sacrifice . . . brush the doors with blood . . . feast on the flesh . . . : the prescriptions here and in 175–79, 184–87 correspond exactly with those in *Exodus* 12.6–8: 'You shall keep it (the sacrificial animal) until the fourteenth day of this month (ἕως τῆς τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης τοῦ μηνὸς τούτου), and all the gathering of the sons of Israel shall slaughter it towards evening (πρὸς ἑσπέραν). And they shall take some of the blood and place it on the two doorposts and on the lintel . . . and they shall eat the flesh on this night (τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ)'. The sacrifice and blood-smearing are done towards the evening of the 14th (cf. 177f.), shortly before the sunset which by Jewish reckoning is the start of the 15th. **[†*on the previous night*†:** mss. τῇ πρόσθε νυκτὶ creates a hiatus (νυκτὶ αἵμ-) and is inconsistent with both *Exodus* 12.8 (above) and the permanent Passover regulations (for which see e.g. N. Collins 1991, 203 n. 9). Kuiper's τῆς πρόσθε νυκτὸς is accepted by most editors as meaning 'before the night', but it can only mean 'during the previous night', making nonsense of the process both syntactically and ritually. Collins (1991, 207f.) argues that 'during the previous night' makes sense if Ezechiel's day began at dawn rather than sunset, but this puts the Passover itself on the night of the 14th, i.e. before the night of the full moon (the 15th), which again seems impossible. Ezechiel simply refers to sacrifice and blood-smearing in the evening (157–59, cf. 178–80, 184–87) and feasting in the ensuing night (160; after the evening sacrifice, 178ff.), i.e. the night of the Passover. He might perhaps have written τῇ (*sc.* ὥρᾳ) πρόσθε νυκτός, 'in the (hour) before night'. For ὥρα as 'time/hour of the day' see LSJ 'ὥρα' II with examples such as Xen. *Hell.* 7.2.22 τῆς ὥρας μικρὸν πρὸ δύντος ἡλίου, 'in the hour a little before sunset'.**]**

so that the terrible angel may pass by the sign: in *Exodus* 12.12f. God says that he himself will pass through the land bringing death to the firstborn and sparing the Israelites' houses, although this is modified in 12.23 where Moses

says that God 'will not permit the destroying one to enter your houses to strike them'. Some later interpreters including Ezechiel preferred to distance God from death more clearly and speak of the angel of death (or simply 'death', 187): »» Jacobson 208f., Lanfranchi 228. For God as angel in other contexts see above on line 99. **you shall feast on the flesh, roasted:** the instruction is given with ritual elaborations in *Exodus* 12.8–11, reflected in lines 179–82 below.

161–66. The king will speedily expel etc.: *Exodus* 12.33, 'the Egyptians were forced to expel the people speedily (σπουδῇ) from the land; for they said, We are all dying'. See also below on 182f. **And when you are about to run off etc.:** the Egyptians will hand over valuables to the Israelites in order to get rid of them, thus compensating them for their years of unpaid labour. *Exodus* 3.21–22: 'I will grant you a favour (χάριν) *vis-à-vis* the Egyptians, and when you run off (ἀποτρέχητε), you will not leave empty-handed. A woman will demand from her neighbour and housemate silver and gold ornaments and apparel (σκεύη ἀργυρᾶ καὶ χρυσᾶ καὶ ἱματισμόν), and you will put these on your sons and your daughters'. In the near-repetitions at *Exodus* 11.1–3 and 12.34–36 both men and women obtain the goods from their opposite numbers. *Exodus* 3.22 adds, 'you will plunder the Egyptians' (σκυλεύσετε τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους, similarly 12.36). Ezechiel and some later texts define the transaction as compensation since the notion of plunder (or in some accounts borrowing and not returning the valuables) embarrassed Jewish exegetes and fuelled anti-Jewish polemics (»» Jacobson 126f., van der Horst 1984, 371). Philo justifies it as both compensation and retribution (*Moses* 1.141), Josephus as gifts from friendly Egyptians (*AJ* 2.314). **[*gold and silver and also apparel*†:** the text is unmetrical, as are several conjectures (Stephanus a fourth-foot spondee, Dindorf and Mras anapaestic feet). Snell's verse is metrical but awkwardly phrased and eliminates ἠδὲ καὶ without much reason. Dübner's deletion (1846, ix, unmentioned by Snell) may well be right, the verse added to spell out the sense of 164 in line with *Exodus* 3.22 etc.**]**

167–71. when you have entered your own country etc.: *Exodus* 12.14–15, 'This day shall be a day of remembrance for you . . . you will make it a festival affirmed by law for ever (νόμιμον αἰώνιον ἑορτάσετε αὐτήν). For seven days you shall eat unleavened bread (ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας ἄζυμα ἔδεσθε) . . . ', followed by detailed prescriptions. There is no biblical precedent for the explanation (*aition*) in lines 168f. that the seven days of the Passover festival originated in the seven days in which the Israelites ate unleavened bread while fleeing from Egypt. Ezechiel may have invented it or more likely adopted it from a recent source (»» Jacobson 125f.). **[**The superfluous **δ'** in **Αἰγύπτου δ' ἄπο** has been explained rather weakly as avoiding the hiatus -πτου ἄπο (e.g. Lanfranchi). Suggested alternatives are to delete it (Stephanus) and tolerate the hiatus (cf. 231) or replace it with something like πέδον ('when you fled the plain of Egypt': Kuiper). In 169 Snell's ⟨ἦθ'⟩ provides a needed verb.**]**

172–74. sacrificing to God the first-born beasts etc.: *Exodus* gives further ritual rules for the future framed as instructions addressed by God to Moses (12.43–13.2) and repeated by Moses to the Israelites (13.3–16). The rules concern in part the Passover festival and in part the consecration to God of all the firstborn male young of humans and domestic beasts to commemorate the killing of the Egyptians' firstborn. The consecration of the firstborn is described in *Exodus* 13.2 (God to Moses) and more fully in 13.12–15 (Moses to the people): 'every young that opens the womb (πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν) from your herds or amongst your livestock, the males (τὰ ἀρσενικά) you shall consecrate to the Lord. Every ass that opens the womb you shall exchange with a lamb or kid (προβάτῳ, 176 n.) . . . Every human firstborn (πᾶν πρωτότοκον ἀνθρώπου) amongst your sons you shall redeem [i.e. with a payment]. And if your son asks you in the future, Why is this?, you shall say to him, The Lord led us out of Egypt with a mighty hand . . . and when Pharaoh stubbornly refused to send us out he killed every firstborn (πᾶν πρωτότοκον) in Egypt . . . For this reason I sacrifice (θύω) every animal that opens the womb (πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν) . . . '. God repeats the instruction to Moses on Mount Sinai, *Exodus* 34.19f. Ezechiel paraphrases the key wording of *Exodus* concerning herds and livestock and adds an explanation of πρωτότευκτα in 173, but he omits the rules for asses and human sons (unless the text is incomplete as it stands: see below). He also seems to imply that such sacrifices are part of the Passover festival, which can hardly be what he meant. Jacobson 130f. perhaps rightly attributes the anomaly to careless composition: Ezechiel links the Passover details and the sacrificing of first-born beasts because they both commemorate features of the Exodus, not because they both belong to the Passover festival. **[**Lanfranchi 230, 239f. offers a different solution, placing a stop at the end of 171 and supposing that line 172 begins a new sentence which is now incomplete because Alexander or Eusebius misconstrued it; Ezechiel, then, might not have connected the consecration rule with the Passover festival at all. It is however unlikely that 172 begins a new sentence (one would expect a connective such as δέ). Possibly the beginning of a new sentence is lost *before* 172, but that too is not very likely; certainly Eusebius (and probably Alexander) thought that all of 152–74 concerned the Passover festival, as the statement introducing the next excerpt shows.**]**

175–192. The Passover instructions repeated

The introductory statement **(καὶ πάλιν etc.)** has been assigned either to Alexander ('Ezechiel says that God has elaborated', Kuiper, Wieneke, Kraus 1968, 167f.; ' . . . that Moses has elaborated ', Stewart 242) or to Eusebius ('Alexander says that Ezechiel has elaborated' Mras (app.), Jacobson 121–24, Lanfranchi 242–4). The second option is certainly correct. The statement picks up the thread from the introduction to 132–74 where Eusebius explicitly reports Alexander quoting Ezechiel. The statements introducing lines 193–242 (**πάλιν μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιλέγει**)

and 243–53 (**καὶ πάλιν μετ' ὀλίγα**) continue the thread. **εἰρηκέναι** corresponds with **εἴρηκε** (*sc.* Ezechiel) in the statement introducing lines 120–31. The recurring word **πάλιν** also suggests that in each of these statements (and before lines 90–95) what follows was not closely connected with the preceding excerpt; such a continuation would be indicated by εἶτα as before lines 59, 96–112, 113–15, 116–19, 254ff. It could hardly be part of the same speech in any case since it largely repeats what has already been said in lines 153–71. It could be God elaborating his instructions to Moses in a separate speech (so e.g. Kraus) but is more probably an adaptation of Moses' repetition of God's instructions to the Israelites as in *Exodus* 12.21–24, 13.3–16; for this option see Strugnell 1967, 449, Jacobson 121–24, Lanfranchi 242–44, Stewart (above). If so, and if the order of Alexander's excerpts corresponds to that of the play, this would place it shortly before the Passover night, at some distance from the burning bush scene. This all has a bearing on the reconstruction of the play (cf. above, pp. 313–17).

This is the only linking statement that does not identify a speaker or a dramatic context (thus causing the problems discussed above), and the extract it introduces begins in mid-sentence. The lack of identification is probably due to Eusebius abridging Alexander's text. The mid-sentence opening could have been intentional (Alexander focusing on the ritual details without worrying about the syntax), or it might be due to the loss of a verse or two at some point in the transmission of Alexander's or Eusebius's text.

As in lines 153–71 these instructions address first the original Passover night (175–87) and then the future commemorative festival (188–92). God's promise of compensation for the Israelites (162–66) is not relevant to either of these and is now omitted. His demand for consecration of the first-born is also omitted, which perhaps confirms that Ezechiel did not think of it as related to the Passover (see above on 172–74). His instructions for preparing and eating the feast, daubing the doorframes and establishing the Passover festival (*Exodus* 12.3–11) are now paraphrased a little more fully than in the previous speech (175–90) and with aetiological additions. The speech concludes (191–92) by repeating God's declaration that the month of the Israelites' release will be 'the beginning of months' (153 n.).

175–77. on the tenth day of this month etc.: *Exodus* 12.3–5, 'On the tenth day of this month let them each take a *probaton*, house by house (κατ' οἰκίαν) . . . an unblemished year-old male *probaton* . . . from the lambs and the kids (ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρνῶν καὶ τῶν ἐρίφων). πρόβατα is a general term for all livestock (sometimes divided between 'smaller', i.e. sheep and goats, and 'larger', i.e. cattle etc.: »» LSJ 'πρόβατον' I.1), so Ezechiel's **πρόβατα** presumably includes goats as in *Exodus* 12.5. It may also imply year-olds (as **bullocks** does), but that was not always a strict requirement. The Passover regulation in *Deuteronomy* 16.2 has simply πρόβατα καὶ βόας (sheep/goats and oxen). King Josiah's great communal Passover sacrifice in Jerusalem (*2Chron.* 35) featured *probata* and lambs, kids

and bullocks in huge numbers. On Ezechiel's inclusion of **bullocks** (unlike *Exodus* 12.5) see Jacobson 129f., Lanfranchi 240.

177–80. Let these be kept . . . and towards evening etc.: see above on 156–60. **and eat all of them roasted including the innards:** *Exodus* 12.8–10, 'they shall eat the flesh fire-roasted (ὀπτὰ πυρὶ) with unleavened bread, on bitter herbs . . . the head with the feet and the innards . . . and what is left from it to the next morning you shall burn up with fire'.

180–83. in this way: girded up etc.: *Exodus* 12.11, 'And you shall eat it in this way (οὕτως δὲ φάγεσθε αὐτό): your loins girded up (περιεζωσμέναι), and your sandals on your feet (καὶ τὰ ὑποδήματα ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν), and your staffs in your hands (αἱ βακτηρίαι ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ὑμῶν); and you shall eat it with speed (μετὰ σπουδῆς). The biblical requirement to eat 'with speed' is now given an *aition*: the Israelites must be prepared to be driven out **with speed (ἐν σπουδῇ**, cf. 151, 161 n.). **[περιεζωσμένοι . . . ἔχοντες** is a participial phrase depending on **οὕτως φάγεσθε** ('eat it in this way, i.e. girded up etc.'). The imperative **ὑποδέδεσθε** intrudes because the participle ὑποδεδεμένοι is metrically impossible. The complicated explanations of the syntax suggested by Jacobson 211 n. 44 and van der Horst 1984, 371f. are not needed.**]**

184–87. It shall be called Pascha etc: a further aetiology, connecting the word Πάσχα with παρέρχομαι 'pass by' (cf. 159: Lanfranchi 238, 241f. comments on the Hebrew etymologies). Strugnell's **Πάσχα** for mss. πᾶς καὶ is convincing though disputed by Jacobson 132–34 (overlooking the aetiological function of lines 184–87 and the difficulty of accounting for καί). **[**The main arguments for Strugnell's conjecture are: (1) κεκλήσεται δὲ πᾶς, with or without και deleted, makes an unmetrical mid-line caesura; (2) attempts to accommodate καί undeleted are unconvincing; (3) a requirement that 'everyone shall have been summoned (κεκλήσεται δὲ πᾶς)' would belong at the beginning of the sacrifice prescriptions rather than the end, and in any case (4) κεκλήσεται nearly always means 'will be called/named' and in tragedy very often introduces etymologies, e.g. Eur. *El.* 1275, *HF* 1330, *Hel.* 1674, *Erec.* F 370.92; (5) the naming of the Pascha here completes the prescriptions for the sacrificial meal as in *Exodus* 12.10–12.**]** **take in your hands a bunch of hyssop-stems etc:** this elaborates the brief instruction in 158f., just as Moses elaborates God's instruction (*Exod.* 12.7) in *Exodus* 12.22: 'You shall take a bunch of hyssop, dip it in some of the blood that is by the door, and place on the lintel and on both the doorposts some of the blood that is by the door'. **so that death may pass by:** almost a repetition of line 159 (see note there).

188–90. This festival you shall observe etc.: see above on 167–71. **†*it will be released*† from these evils** seems to be another aetiology in addition to the one given in 167ff. Leaven is associated with impurity, so its rejection symbolizes the Israelites' casting off of their troubles (»» Jacobson 128f.). The idea of release (ἀπαλλαγή) from evils (κακῶν) or 'troubles' (πόνων) is very common in

tragedy and elsewhere (e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 1, 19, *PV* 773, Eur. *Andr.* 1253, *HF* 1330: with future passive verb, Hdt. 2.120.15, Isocr. 5.95, 7.84). With the transmitted text ***it*** has to be the Jewish people, but the phrasing is improbably abrupt.

[ἀπαλλαγήσεται is often rendered implausibly as 'you will be released', 'the people will be released', 'there will be a release' etc. ἀπαλλαγήσετε (conjectured by Gaisford and Van der Horst, printed by Lanfranchi) is impossible unless it was a grammatical error (the Greek for 'you will be released' is ἀπαλλαγήσεσθε). Kuiper's ἐστι τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγή makes unconvincing sense ('there is a release from these evils'). If the verb-ending intruded from the end of the previous verse, Gibert's ἀπαλλαγὴν νέμει is plausible ('God grants a release from these ills and in this month provides an exodus'). He compares Eur. *Supp.* 615 κακῶν δ' ἀναψυχὰς θεοὶ βροτοῖς νέμουσι, 'gods grant to mortals reliefs from ills'.**]**

191f. in this month etc.: see above on 153–54. **χρόνων**: lit. 'periods' but here **years** as in 153.

193–242. The crossing of the Red Sea and destruction of the Egyptian army (narrative report)

Eusebius's statement (**Again, after other things etc.**) like those introducing 32ff., 68ff. and 132ff. indicates that Alexander quoted or paraphrased some other account(s) of the events at the Red Sea, perhaps from Demetrius and *Exodus* as before lines 243ff. He now returns to Ezechiel's text for illustration. How Ezechiel filled the gap between the previous excerpts and this later scene is unknown. *Exodus* relates the story of the plagues at length in chapters 5–12, then quite briefly the Israelites' departure and journey to the Red Sea and the Pharaoh's decision to pursue them (12.37–39, 13.17–14.5). The messenger's report follows the ensuing narrative of events at the Red Sea (*Exodus* 14.6–10 and 19–28) quite closely with some minor deviations (see notes below) but omits lines 11–18 and the beginning of 19 in which the Israelites complain to Moses about his strategy, Moses assures them that God is protecting them, and God instructs Moses to divide the Red Sea and lead the Israelites through it so that he can destroy the Egyptian army. The messenger could know nothing of all this and only perceives God's influence as it becomes increasingly evident (»» Lanfranchi 267–69, cf. 2018, 137f.). The timing of events during the night is rather vague (see below on 224–28, 231–36).

We know nothing about this dramatic episode other than the speech itself. It seems to be addressed to an Egyptian audience (cf. p. 314 with n. 10), and if Ezechiel was following normal tragic conventions it will have begun with the messenger's arrival and some dialogue leading to his narrative.[42] ὡς γάρ in line

[42] Jacobson 149 suggests the dialogue might have been complex and extensive as in Aesch. *Pers.* 277–336, but that passage includes choral interjections.

193 suggests that the narrative itself began after one or more introductory lines.[43] Like many Euripidean set-pieces it presents a series of carefully defined and contrasted scenes: the Egyptian army sets out, vast and threatening (193ff.); when (ἐπεὶ δέ, 204) they find the Israelites, they see an exhausted and defenceless rabble; then (ἔπειτα, 215) they encamp confidently; then (ἔπειτα, 220) the cloud-column mysteriously appears; and then (κἄπειτα, 224) Moses strikes the sea and the climactic events are unleashed (»» Lanfranchi 265–67 with his notes on lines 204–14, 215–19, 220–24, 230–42). The speech also replicates the epic style of classic messenger-speeches, with frequent reminiscences of the report in Aeschylus's *Persians*, also delivered by a survivor of the disaster and dwelling on the vast numbers and overconfidence of the Persian ruler and his forces and the role of divine hostility in their destruction (»» Snell 1971, 176–78, Jacobson 136–38, Lanfranchi 250–63). Jacobson 138–40 adds general similarities with Herodotus's accounts of the Persians at the Hellespont, Thermopylae and Salamis.

The crossing of the Red Sea is strikingly depicted in one of the many murals from the 3rd C. AD synagogue at Dura Europos discovered in 1932 (others depict the baby Moses rescued from the river, Moses and the burning bush and Moses leading the departure from Egypt). On one side of this scene Moses holds his staff over the sea as the Egyptians perish in it. On the other he watches over the Israelites (depicted as an army) as they march away. The hand of God appears above both sides, determining the fate of each.

193. σὺν ὄχλῳ τῷδ(ε), with this host seems to refer to a previous description, but the host is described in the next ten lines. Lanfranchi's τῶνδ' giving 'set forth from this palace' is rather plausible (cf. Eur. *Orestes* 844 τῶνδ' ἀφώρμησεν δόμων) and would fix the location of this scene.

194–96. with ten thousand armed men etc.: *Exodus* 14.7, 'and taking six hundred picked chariots and all the Egyptians' cavalry and senior commanders (τριστάτας) over all of them.' Ezechiel oddly describes the departing army as already arrayed for battle and adds foot-soldiers who are unsuited for a rapid pursuit. In Philo's narrative the Israelites see the army appearing over the horizon, ready to attack (*Moses* 1.169).

198f. phalanx-men: specialized heavy infantry. The word **φαλαγγικοὶ** only here, *metri gratia* (normally φαλαγγῖται). **with spaces for chariots etc.: διεκδρομὰς . . . τόπους** is lit. 'having areas as through-out-runs for chariots'.

201. [Αἰγυπτίου: the adj. scanned as three syllables is an epicism (*Iliad* 9.382, *Od.* 6x, all with long final syllable; Αἰγύπτιος four syllables, *Od.* 2.15, 4.385). In tragedy always four syllables as in 43 Αἰγύπτιον and 138 Αἰγυπτίων.**]**

[43] Cf. Soph. *Aj.* 749 (γάρ), *Ant.* 1196 (δέ), *OT* 1241 (ὅπως γάρ), *OC* 1586f. (ὡς μὲν γάρ), Eur. *Hcld.* 799f., *IA* 1540ff. (both ἐπεὶ γάρ). Most Euripidean messengers launch straight into their narratives, often with ἐπεί.

202. τὸν πάντα . . . αὐτῶν ἀριθμόν, their total number: Aesch. *Pers.* 339f. ὁ πᾶς ἀριθμὸς . . . ναῶν, 'the total number of ships' (πᾶς ἀριθμός is a regular term, e.g. Hdt. 6.8, 8.48, Thuc. 2.7.2). **[**Mss. ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν makes an unmetrical 4th-foot spondee. **στρατοῦ** is mistakenly repeated from the previous line-end.**]**

205f. lying . . . beside the shore: παρ' ἀκτὴν . . . βεβλημένοι approximates *Exodus* 14.9 παρεμβεβληκότας παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν, 'encamped beside the sea' (Lanfranchi 254f.). **βεβλημένοι** is lit. 'having cast themselves' (»» LSJ 'βάλλω' A.II.2b). **Ἐρυθρᾶς Θαλάσσης, the Red Sea:** as in the Septuagint and all later Greek texts. In Hebrew 'the Sea of Reeds' (*Yam Suph*), which probably refers to the Bitter Lakes or Lake Timsah on the routes of the ancient Nile–Red Sea canal and the modern Suez canal (see also on 216 below).

207–9. [δίδουν: unaugmented imperfect, an epicism seen occasionally in tragic messenger-speeches (Aesch. *Pers.* 376, 416, 458, 506, Soph. *OT* 1249, Eur. *Bacch.* 1006, 1134, all but the last at line-beginning). This form is unique in pre-Byzantine Greek, the equivalent δίδον only in *Hom. Hymn.* 2.327 and (supplied) [Hesiod] fr. 199.9 M–W = 154d.9 Most. ἐδίδουν (3rd pl. for ἐδίδοσαν) is Hellenistic and later (Blass–Debrunner §94; Schwyzer I.688). **ἔγκοποι πόνῳ, wearied with toil:** mss. ἔμπονοι κόπῳ would mean something like 'tolerant of fatigue'; corrected by Sansone 1984, Arnott 1985 (cf. Jacobson 150). **ἀποσκευή, household equipment** perhaps misinterprets *Exodus* 12.37 where the departing Israelites number 600,000 men πλὴν τῆς ἀποσκευῆς, 'not counting their *families*' (»» Jacobson 41, 150, Lanfranchi 256).**]**

210–13. And they . . . on seeing us etc.: *Exodus* 14.10, 'And the sons of Israel looked up and saw . . . and were greatly frightened, and . . . cried out to the Lord (ἀνεβόησαν . . . πρὸς Κύριον)'. Ezechiel makes the Israelites **all unarmed** and pathetically vulnerable, although the Hebrew text of *Exodus* 13.18 was widely understood to mean that they were armed when they set out. They are an armed force in *Exodus* 17.8ff., *Numbers* 1–2, 21, 31 (cf. above on the Dura Europos mural). Philo and Josephus make them unarmed (*Moses* 1.170, 172, *AJ* 2.321, 326). Eusebius notes Alexander's comment on this contradiction at the end of his excerpts from the *Exagôgê* (*PE* 9.29).[44] **they complained:** omission

[44] ἐπιζητεῖν δέ τινα πῶς οἱ Ἰσραηλῖται ὅπλα ἔσχον ἄνοπλοι ἐξελθόντες· ἔφασαν γὰρ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ὁδὸν ἐξελθόντες καὶ θυσιάσαντες πάλιν ἀνακάμψειν. φαίνεται οὖν τοὺς μὴ κατακλυσθέντας τοῖς ἐκείνων ὅπλοις χρήσασθαι: 'And (Alexander says) that someone (probably Demetrius) asks how they had weapons when they went out unarmed; for they (the Israelites) said they would go out for a journey of three days and would return again after making their sacrifice. So it appears that those not engulfed (i.e. the Israelites) used those ones' (i.e. the Egyptians') weapons.' This peculiar explanation seems to refer to *Exodus* 8.23, where Moses insists that his people must be allowed to travel into the wilderness for three days

of a connecting 'and' here and in line 231 makes the narrative more urgent. **[**For **ἀπετάθησαν** see LSJ 'ἀποτείνω' 3, Lampe 'ἀποτείνομαι' 3. Strugnell 1967, 450 n. 3 corrected the unmetrical and meaningless ms. text. **θεὸν πατρῷον** is best taken as direct object of the preceding phrase.**]**

214. all of us . . . relished the sight: ἡμᾶς χάρμα εἶχεν is lit. 'pleasure held us', the malicious pleasure of a triumphant enemy (LSJ 'χάρμα' I.2, van der Horst 1984, 374).

216. Beelzephon: the place is named in *Exodus* 14.2 where God tells Moses that the Israelites should encamp 'opposite the way-station midway between Migdol and the sea, opposite Beelzephon, facing them by the sea' (cf. 14.9, *Numbers* 33.7f.). In the Hebrew text the way-station has a name, Pi-hahiroth. The name Beelzephon suggests a cult site of Baal-zaphon, the Canaanite storm-god who was regarded as a protector of shipping. Gmirkin 2006, 222–39 discusses the likely route of the Exodus and (231–35) favours identifying Pi-hahiroth as the site of Ptolemaic Arsinoe, near the mouth of the Nile–Red Sea canal.

217. the Titan Sun: Helios/Sun was a son of the Titans Hyperion and Theia, parents also of Selene/Moon and Eos/Dawn (Hesiod, *Theogony* 371–74). **Τιτάν** is listed as an epithet of Helios, and Τιτανίς of Selene (cf. Ap. Rhod. 4.54), in Dorotheus of Sidon's *Epithets of the Seven Stars* (1st C. BC–1st C. AD), fr. 3a.8, 13 (p. 435 Pingree). For Τιτὰν Ἥλιος see e.g. Nonnus, *Dionys.* 19. 207; for Τιτάν meaning Helios, Bruchmann 1893, 148.

220f. things wondrous to see, divine prodigies: θείων τεραστίων seems to depend on θαυμάστ(α), 'wondrous things consisting of divine prodigies'.

221–23. a great column of cloud etc.: *Exodus* 14.19f., 'The column of cloud (ὁ στῦλος τῆς νεφέλης) rose out from in front of them and stood behind them (ἔστη ἐκ τῶν ὀπίσω αὐτῶν) and entered midway between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel and stood there (εἰσῆλθεν ἀνὰ μέσον τῆς παρεμβολῆς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τῆς παρεμβολῆς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἔστη)'. The Egyptians do not know that the cloud has been leading the Israelites and notice it only as it takes this new position. **[†πρὸ γῆς μέγας†:** the phrase is almost meaningless here and presumably due to confusion with the end of the previous line. Stein's πρὸ ἡμέρας 'before daylight' (1936/37, 20) is inappropriate (*pace* van der Horst 1984, 374), contradicting *Exodus* and implying that God left the Israelites unprotected for most of the night. Lanfranchi suggests πρὸς ἑσπέραν 'towards evening', but the time has already been stated in lines 217f. An indication of place would be more suitable, e.g. πρόσθεν στρατοῦ, 'in front of our army'.**]**

224–26. And then their leader Moses etc.: Moses strikes the sea and parts it instantly, whereas in *Exodus* 14.21 he 'extended his hand over the sea'

---

to make a sacrifice (but that does not happen since the Pharaoh breaks his promise to allow it). Josephus says that the sea carried the Egyptians' weapons to the farther shore where the Israelites collected them for their own use (*AJ* 2.349).

(ἐξέτεινε τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν), no doubt holding the staff as advised by God in verse 16, and God caused a violent wind to blow throughout the night and gradually divide the waters so that the Israelites could cross before dawn (the Egyptians are destroyed during the pre-dawn watch, 14.24). Ezechiel omits the wind and the passing of time, compressing the sequence of events (see further below on 231–36). Moses' magical striking of the sea (like the striking of the Nile which started the first plague, *Exod.* 7.17–21) was a widespread and probably ancient Jewish tradition, repeated by Artapanus (Euseb. *PE* 9.27.36), Philo (*Moses* 1.177) and Josephus (*AJ* 2.338). It suits Ezechiel's dramatic narrative at this point (»» Jacobson 141f., Lanfranchi 271). **the one he used before etc.: τῇ δὴ πρὶν . . . ἐξεμήσατο** is lit. 'with which in fact he previously contrived . . . '. **σημεῖα καὶ τεράστι(α), signs and prodigies**: i.e. prodigies serving as signs (hendiadys); the terms are often combined in biblical texts (Lanfranchi 260, 269f.). **[**Mss. τέρατ(α) is unmetrical. Most recent editors print Mras's τεράατ(α), a rare form seen only in later hexameters (Dionys. Perieget. 604, Quint. Smyrn. 4x, Tzetzes 1x). Gaisford's **τεράστι(α)** is commoner and more likely (cf. 91, 94), and printed by Lanfranchi. **ἐξεμήσατο** < ἐκμήδομαι; the compound is unique here, μήδομαι mostly Homeric (κακὰ μήσατο 3x) and tragic.**]**

228–31. all of them . . . rushed etc.: *Exodus* 14.22f., 'the sons of Israel entered into the middle of the sea on the dry ground . . . and the Egyptians pursued and entered behind them'.

231–36. we met with night . . . our chariots' wheels would not turn . . . from the heaven we saw a great fiery light: *Exodus* 14.24f., 'in the dawn watch the Lord looked upon the Egyptians' army in a column of fire and cloud (ἐν στύλῳ πυρὸς καὶ νεφέλης) and threw the Egyptians' army into confusion and bound up the axles of their chariots (συνέδησε τοὺς ἄξονας τῶν ἁρμάτων αὐτῶν)'. **νυκτὸς εἰσεκύρσαμεν** means 'we met with night' (so Jacobson 146f.), not (vacuously) 'we entered (the sea) during the night' (e.g Lanfranchi 261, LSJ 'εἰσκύρω'; the compound verb is found only here). This is a supernatural darkness caused by God, making the normal darkness of night (or the early morning twilight) intensely dark. Philo, *Moses* is more explicit: 'a black mist gripped the whole heaven, the night being murky (γνοφώδους)' (1.176), and then the cloud-column threw the Egyptians into confusion (1.178). Jacobson notes that the Hebrew text of *Exodus* 14.20 could be taken to mean that God provided light for the Israelites and darkness for the Egyptians. **their god, I suppose, was present:** the messenger could only sense the presence of God which is explicit in *Exodus* 14.24.

237. then a great wave . . . : δ(έ) is 'apodotic', responding to **ὡς δ(έ) and when . . .** , as often in Homer (»» Denniston 1954, 179).

238–41. someone seeing it yelled . . . : *Exodus* 14.25, 'the Egyptians said, Let us flee (φύγωμεν) from the face of Israel, for the Lord (ὁ Κύριος) is warring on the Egyptians for them'. In *Exodus* this happens a little earlier when the

Egyptians first sense God's influence. Ezechiel reserves it for the critical moment. **῾Υψίστου, the Highest one's:** the Egyptians are made to recognize the superiority of the Israelites' god, as the messenger has done in lines 235f. Theos Hypsistos was the regular Greek name for Yahweh. **[**In 239 Stephanus rightly changed mss. χέρας to **χερός** (cf. Kuiper 262, van der Horst 1984, 375) although Snell and others do not. πρόσθεν always governs the genitive case, and in *Exodus* at least the hand of God is always singular (*Exod.* 3.20, 7.4, 7.5 etc., also in the Dura Europos mural, p. 361 above; cf. 6, **the ruler's hand**).**]**

243–269. The oasis at Elim; the phoenix

Exodus relates two episodes between the Israelites' crossing of the Red Sea and their entry into the Sinai desert. First they reached Marah (Hebrew 'bitter') where Moses sweetened the water on God's advice and God promised his protection in return for the Israelites' obedience (15.22–26). Then (15.27) 'they came to Elim, where there were twelve springs and seventy palm-trees (δώδεκα πηγαὶ ὑδάτων καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα στελέχη φοινίκων), and camped there beside the waters'. Alexander apparently summarized these episodes with reference to *Exodus* and to Demetrius's history and then illustrated them with Ezechiel's descriptions of the oasis and the phoenix. Ezechiel presumably did not include the episode at Marah, which had more ambivalent features (the Israelites' complaints answered by God's demand for their obedience) and would have needed a separate dramatic setting. On Trencsényi-Waldapfel's view that this final scene was set at Marah see above, p. 313 n. 7.

Ezechiel elaborates the Bible's brief description of the oasis poetically, making it a *locus amoenus*, an idealized natural location rich in water, shade-giving trees and nourishing vegetation. The episode is conveniently set near the oasis rather than in it so that it can be described in this way by someone (presumably one of a reconnaissance party) who has just discovered it. The Elim episode was interpreted diversely in Jewish sources; Josephus, *AJ* 3.9–11 makes it the opposite of a *locus amoenus* and another site of tribulation for the Israelites. In Ezechiel's tragedy it probably marked the end of their sufferings in Egypt and the prospect of a prosperous future in the promised land, perhaps anticipating the biblical reconnaissance of the land itself in *Numbers* 13. The explorers in Philo, *Moses* 1.227f. describe Palestine in similarly idealizing terms, and in *Moses* 1.188f. Philo interprets the springs and palm-trees of the oasis allegorically as 'clear signs and indications of our nation's welfare' (ἀγαθῶν τῶν ἐθνικῶν ἐναργῆ σημεῖα καὶ δείγματα). »» Trencsényi-Waldapfel 155f., Jacobson 152–57, 165f., Lanfranchi 277–82.

Alexander introduces the description of **the bird that appeared** as part of the same speech, following the description of the oasis with little or no interval. Neither the scout (for obvious reasons) nor Alexander identifies the bird, but the description clearly evokes the mythical phoenix which in Ezechiel's time was

identified with the Egyptian *bnw/benu* and associated with the cult of the Sun at Heliopolis. The phoenix is briefly mentioned in [Hesiod] fr. 304 M–W (= 254 Most) for its vast life span. Herodotus (2.73, allegedly drawing on Hecataeus [*FGrH* 1 F 324]) gives a colourful description and records the belief of the people of Heliopolis that it lived in Arabia and came to Heliopolis once in every five hundred years bringing its dead father for burial in the temple. Later writers make it clear that only one phoenix lived at any time, a new one being generated from the remains of its father, and that each appearance at Heliopolis signified the beginning of a new era; also that its appearances could be invented for political purposes (cf. Pliny, *NH* 10.3–5, Tacitus, *Annals* 6.28). Christianity adopted the phoenix as a symbol of resurrection and salvation.[45] The *Exagôgê*'s connection of the phoenix with the Exodus is unique except that a sixth-century Coptic *Sermon on Mary* states that it appeared in Heliopolis on the occasions of the sacrifice of Abel, the Exodus and the Resurrection; this can be related to Ezechiel's play only remotely, if at all.[46] The connection might have originated in an Egyptian chronology which put the Exodus in the time of Ahmose I (first king of the post-Hyksos New Kingdom) and could have recorded an appearance of the phoenix at that time.[47]

The scout talks simply of an exotic bird, describing its appearance and behaviour with the attention to detail typical of Greek scientific writing and literary *ecphrases*. It is seen in its usual habitat, not on one of its rare visits to Heliopolis, and nothing in the description suggests it is one of a kind or has miraculous properties; it is simply **a strange creature, a wondrous thing such as no one has seen before** (254f.). The scout's point of view is however necessarily limited, and Ezechiel could have relied on his audience to infer the bird's significance (or it could have been revealed in the continuation of this scene); it seems unlikely that he inserted it into the Exodus story just for the sake of an

[45] The standard work on the phoenix in antiquity is van den Broek 1972. Holladay 519f. lists Greek and Jewish sources with bibliography to 1983. Niehoff 1996 compares rabbinic and early Christian interpretations. Iconography: van den Broek, Plates 1–40; *LIMC* 8, 'Phoinix (3)' (R. Vollkommer). For the phoenix in Ezechiel's scene see especially van den Broek 121f., 252, 254, 257f., Jacobson 157–64, Lanfranchi 290–96, Heath 2006. On the Greek name (φοῖνιξ = 'crimson' or 'Phoenician', probably from a Semitic term for the crimson dye produced in Phoenicia), van den Broek 51–66.

[46] Van den Broek 33–50 with text and translation, Jacobson 159, Lanfranchi 292.

[47] The timing of the Exodus in Ahmose I's reign is attributed to the Hellenistic historian Ptolemy of Mendes by Tatian and Clement (*FGrH* 611 F 1a–b). An appearance of the phoenix in the reign of 'Amasis' is mentioned by Tacitus, *Annals* 6.28. The connection of the phoenix with the Exodus was inferred by Lightfoot 1890, 85: cf. Jacobson 159f., Lanfranchi 294, Heath 2006, 29.

exotic description.[48] The likeliest significance is that the completion of the Exodus marked the start of a new era (if not a renewal of time itself), as stated by God in his instructions to Moses (153 n.). Ezechiel may have recalled the alleged appearance of the phoenix in the time of Ptolemy III Euergetes, probably in connection with the calendar reform and declaration of a new era enacted in the Canopus decree of 238 BC.[49] Some other possibly relevant associations of the phoenix (the Utopian location, φοῖνιξ = 'palm-tree') are discussed by Jacobson 161–63.

244. πρὸς αὐτῇ τῇδέ γ(ε) . . . νάπῃ, right next to this valley: lit. 'close to this very valley' (**γε** emphatic): »» LSJ 'αὐτός' I.1 near end, and e.g. Eur. *El.* 513, 636, *Cyc.* 682, [Aesch.] *PV* 729, 847.

246f. from there, then: δὲ . . . νυν draws attention to the description, like δέ νυ in *Iliad* 1.382, 22.405, Ap. Rhod. 2.698, 4.1428, cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 412 (μέν νυν), LSJ 'νῦν' II.2. **a sign like a column of fire:** the **σημεῖον** is both a supernatural phenomenon and a marker (cf. 90, 226). The scout, like the messenger (221ff., 234ff.), recognizes its nature but cannot define it exactly or recognize its origin. Audience and readers might recognize it as the column of cloud and fire that guides the Israelites and protected them at the Red Sea (»» Jacobson 156, Heath 2006, 40 comments on the visual impact of this description). **[κατ' εὐφρόνης, down from the darkness:** not 'in the night' as usually translated (Eur. *IA* 1109 is an unreliable parallel; cf. 259, LSJ 'κατά' I). εὐφρόνη denotes the darkness of night rather than simply 'night' in e.g. Soph. *El.* 19, Pind. *Nem.* 7. 3.**]**

251. ἐρυμνά, sturdy: or possibly 'lofty' (Wieneke); ἐρυμνός may be 'strong, well-built' or 'high, steep' (of mountains, cliffs, defensible positions etc.). **[**Lanfranchi conjectures εὐερνὰ 'flourishing' (with short first syllable as in 209 ἀποσκεὐή), comparing Philo, *Life of Moses* 1.188 στελέχη νέα φοινίκων εὐερνέστατα, but the correct form is εὐερνῆ (< εὐερνής) which would hardly have been misread as ἐρυμνά.**]**

252. ἐπίρρυτος, well-watered: more often of well-watered or irrigated areas (LSJ 'ἐπίρρυτος' II.2). **[**Wieneke conjectured περίρρυτος to avoid the hiatus καὶ ἐπ-, but van der Horst 1984, 375 notes that the sense 'flowed-around' (or 'flowing around', Eur. *Pho.* 209) is not apt here. He interprets **ἐπίρρυτος** as 'overflowing, abundant' comparing Aesch. *Eum.* 907 καρπόν . . . γαίας καὶ βοτῶν ἐπίρρυτον, but that refers to a harvest 'in-flowing' continually. Kuiper's κατάρρυτος gives the right meaning but is palaeographically unlikely.**]**

255. [ὥρακε: on the form see Schmidt 1968, 75f., who also (n. 6) defends the hiatus. Kuiper and Snell rewrote the phrase to avoid it.**]**

---

[48] Heath 2006, 36: 'the symbolism of the Phoenix is not obviously the point of the passage, but only indirectly so, if at all'.

[49] Kuiper 270; van den Broek 106–8. This provides a likely *terminus post quem* for the *Exagôgê*, but it need not have been a very recent event.

256. twice the length of an eagle: Herodotus and some later writers make the phoenix similar to an eagle in shape and size, others compare the ostrich or the peacock (»» van den Broek 251–53).

257–60. with feathers of various colours: lit. 'with varied feathers and colours' (hendiadys). **crimson: πορφυροῦν** denotes a broader spectrum than our 'purple' (cf. on Phrynichus **F 13** in Vol. 1). The colour was also known as φοῖνιξ (above, p. 366 n. 45). Ancient descriptions of the phoenix's plumage varied widely but shades of red and yellow/gold/saffron naturally predominate (»» van den Broek 253–56).

261. head . . . similar to domestic cocks: i.e. crowned with a comb or crest, often represented as rays because of the phoenix's association with the Sun (»» van den Broek 233–38, 244–51). **[**Voss amended the corrupt mss. text which Stephanus had partially corrected. Editors have reproduced Voss's κοττοῖς, but the word is properly κόττοις. For κόττος 'cock' see Hesychius π 3550 πρόκοττα (' . . . cocks are called κόττοι because of the protrusion on their head', an unlikely explanation), κ 3809 κόττος· ὄρνις, and for the accentuation e.g. Herodian, *General Prosody* p. 191.15 Lentz. Lanfranchi's conjecture (p. 287) κάρα δ' ἀκτῖσιν ἡμέρας παρεμφερές ('his head (was) similar to rays of daylight') is unmetrical.**]**

262. with an eye: κόρη is technically 'pupil' but can stand for the whole eye (a synecdoche, overlooked in LSJ 'κόρη'), e.g. Eur. *Hec.* 972 'I could not look at you with raised eyes (προσβλέπειν ὀρθαῖς κόραις), *Hyps.* F 752c 'run your eyes (κόρας) skywards and look at (πρόσβλεψον) the painted reliefs'. The phoenix's brilliant eyes are variously described: »» van den Broek 257. **quince-yellow:** so LSJ 'μήλινος' II.2, a rich golden-yellow.

263. and the pupil resembled a seed: see previous note. κόκκος is a general term but here probably suggests the scarlet gall of the kermes oak (*quercus coccifera*) or a red pomegranate-seed. Thus the eye is yellow with a scarlet pupil.

266f. as one could apprehend: νοῆσαι suggests inference from what 'appeared' (**ἐφαίνετο**) to the observers (Heath 2006, 35). **all the winged creatures . . . rushed after him submissively:** Tacitus, *Ann.* 6.28 describes the phoenix parading *multo ceterarum volucrum comitatu novam faciem mirantium*, 'with a prolific company of the other birds marvelling at this novel sight'. Achilles Tatius 3.25.5 has them forming an honorific bodyguard (χορὸς . . . ὥσπερ δορυφόρων) as he brings his father to Heliopolis for burial. Van den Broek 193 compares descriptions of the honouring of new rulers at their inauguration.

269. lifting his feet etc.: lit. 'lifting a rapid foot-step'. For Lactantius the (ostrich-sized) phoenix's gait is *levis ac velox, regali plena decore*, 'light and swift, full of royal dignity' (*On the Phoenix*, 179).

UNIDENTIFIED POETS: TEXTS AND SUMMARIES (*Adespota*)

I add a small selection of unattributed items (three papyrus fragments, four mythographic summaries) which help to illustrate developments in postclassical tragedy. The first two papyrus fragments have been mentioned above in connection with Astydamas's Hector *(p. 35) and Antiphon's* Andromache *(p. 14). The third, the 'Gyges fragment', is a striking sample of a Hellenistic tragedy based on a historical text (in this case Herodotus). The summaries from Hyginus's collection are brief but revealing sketches of plots involving family separations, lost identities, wanderings, perils, recognitions and restorations of the kind best known to us from some late plays of Euripides (two of them presuppose the events of his* Iphigenia in Tauris*).*

Other relatively substantial papyrus fragments might be added, but some could be from the fifth century[1] *and some are of otherwise obscure status.*[2] *There are also two other fragmentary tragedies of Pacuvius,* Iliona *and* Medus*, which like his* Chryses *(pp. 402f. below) were probably adapted more or less freely from Hellenistic originals whose convoluted plots are summarized by Hyginus:*[3]

> *Fab.* 109 is an alternative to the plot of Euripides' *Hecuba*. Priam's daughter Iliona is married to the Thracian king Polymestor and when her baby brother Polydorus is sent away from Troy for his safety she raises

[1] Adesp. F 625 (pp. 17, 109 above), F 626 (p. 25 n. 4, p. 79), 640b (pp. 49, 69), F 653 (p. 211), F 663 (Iphigenia at Aulis).

[2] Adesp. F 658 (see Vol. 1, p. 189f.), F 665 (a scene modelled on part of the first episode of Euripides' *Phoenissae*), F 672a (*TrGF* 5.1142–44, Odysseus in Troy), F 680 and 682 (actors' scripts set to music: »» Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 185–89 on F 680). Adesp. F 646a (Silenus: *TrGF* 5.1135f.), 655 (Atlas) and 667a (Medea: cf. p. 50, n. 29) are included as satyric in O'Sullivan–Collard 2013, 468–97.

[3] »» Schierl 2006, 312–41 (*Iliona*), 342–85 (*Medus*) with literature on pp. 321 and 353. The question of Pacuvius's dependence on Greek originals is debated, cf. below, pp. 402f. On the relationship between Roman republican tragedies and Greek originals more generally see Manuwald 2011, 20–22, 282–92 with pp. 196 (Naevius), 206 (Ennius), 210–15 (Pacuvius), 219f. (Accius) and Manuwald 2016.

him as her own son along with her son by Polymestor. After the fall of Troy Polymestor tries to kill Polydorus in order to please the victorious Greeks but mistakenly kills his own son instead (presumably misled by Iliona). Polydorus then learns from his sister his true parentage and together they kill Polymestor.

In *Fab.* 27 Medus, son of Medea and king Aegeus of Athens, searches for his mother after her exile from Athens and falls into the hands of her treacherous uncle Perses who fears death at his hands. He avoids execution by claiming to be Creon's son Hippotes seeking vengeance on Medea. She has not recognized him and tries to eliminate him by alleging (falsely as she thinks) that he is really Medus and has come intending to kill Perses. The truth emerges in time to save Medus from execution and with his mother's help he kills Perses and regains his grandfather's kingdom.

Pacuvius's Atalanta *was also probably adapted from a Hellenistic original, although there is no corresponding summary in Hyginus (cf. pp. 397 n. 5, 403). For other summaries of Hyginus which might reflect Hellenistic plots see above, pp. 31–33 (*Fab. *72,* Antigone*) and 294 (*Fab. *86,* Pelopidae*).*

Adesp. F 649
The death of Hector

Text. P. Oxy. 36.2746 (1st–2nd C. AD) ed. Coles 1968 with photo, 1970 (*Ox. Pap.* vol. 36); *TrGF* 2.221–23 with *addenda* 5.1136, cf. *MusTr* 254–7, 302. Image at POxy: Oxyrhynchus online.

Discussions. Fernández Galiano 1978; Gentili 1979; Xanthakis-Karamanos 1997, 398f.; Mazzoldi 2001, 270–80; Catenacci 2002; Fantuzzi–Hunter 2004, 433; Easterling 2005, 32f.; Le Guen 2007, 102–5; Ferrari 2009; Taplin 2009, 259–62 (cf. 2014, 149); Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 195–98; Liapis 2016, 77–84; Medda 2018; Hornblower 2019, 105f.; Jackson 2020, 71f.

The text is a single complete column written casually on the back of a documentary papyrus of the first century AD. It is truncated on both sides and the columns stray towards the left lower down. Speaker-notations are partly or wholly lost, and some lines in the upper part and nearly all of those in the narrower lower part (lines 20–35) are incomplete. There is no punctuation except for paragraphi which seem to mark off the sections in which Cassandra converses with Priam (1–5a), the Chorus (5b–10), Deiphobus (11–31) and Priam again (32ff.; the paragraphus before line 9 seems to mark Cassandra's shift from speech to song).[1] *The notation* B *(numeral 2) written by a different hand in line 15 is unexplained. The heading ᾠδή indicates that the inset verses which it precedes are to be sung.*[2]

The layout of the text is problematic. Much of it is readily identified as iambic trimeters (1f., 6f., 11, 14, 17, 20f., 24f., 28–30), and Coles suggested it could all have been trimeters. Gentili argued that both the indented lines and the unindented lines 5–8 and 31 are short lyric phrases designed to be sung. This interpretation has been influential and is recently reaffirmed by Medda, but Ferrari argues that the text can be reconstructed as spoken trimeters throughout and that the peculiarities of the layout are due to the conversion of such a text to one requiring the indented phrases to be sung. This entails some minor adjustments in the

[1] Cf. Ferrari 21 n. 1, 25.

[2] Gentili and others interpret these headings as calling for some singing to be improvised before the inset verse. Against this see Ferrari 23f., Medda 69f.

text (see lines 6, 8, 13) and more importantly assumes that in some lines (5, 10, 13, 16, 19) it continued far beyond the right edge of the fragment, with large gaps intervening before the traces seen in the last four of these.[3] *But Gentili's interpretation also involves difficulties: if lines 5–8 were sung the instruction ᾠδή would not have been needed before line 10, and the interpretation does not account for the traces just mentioned.*[4] *On balance Ferrari's interpretation seems more plausible. The eccentric layout is not so surprising in a casual copy probably made for a performer.*

Cassandra converses with Priam and the chorus as Hector's duel with Achilles begins (1–10) and then is amazed at the entrance of Deiphobus who is not before the walls with Hector as she had supposed (11–19). She then witnesses Hector's death and foresees that it will lead to Troy's destruction (23–31). The situation is based on Iliad *22, where Priam and Hecuba watch from the walls as Achilles approaches Hector and plead with their son to retreat into the city. Hector resolves to face Achilles but panics when they come face to face and flees before him until Athena, impersonating Deiphobus, persuades him that they should face Achilles together. In the final duel Hector avoids Achilles' first spear-cast but Athena returns the spear to Achilles. Hector's spear strikes Achilles' shield but lodges there, and after calling vainly on Deiphobus for a second spear he realises that Athena has deceived him and is left at the mercy of Achilles' fatal thrust. The culmination of this scene is reflected in the papyrus fragment but presented, strikingly, from the witnesses' point of view.*

In Gentili's interpretation Cassandra is said to be 'seeing' the combat clairvoyantly from within the city and the scene is said to be modelled on the scene in which she envisions Agamemnon's death inside

---

[3] In line 10 the continuation would about half as long again as lines 1 and 2. Lines 5, 13, 16 and 19 would be a little less long than that. The gaps were perhaps meant to mark off the short sung phrases from spoken continuations.

[4] Medda (68) suggests they might have belonged to a separate column of text, but they actually fall below or above the ends of some other lines (2, 6, 7, 14, 17), most obviously in line 16. And it seems more than coincidental that all the lines in question are either nearly complete trimeters (6, 7) or could be the beginnings of trimeters (5b, 13, 16, 19, 23, 27) or can be combined to make trimeters (4–5a, 8–9a, 31–32).

the palace in Aeschylus's Agamemnon.[5] *The verbal similarities are slight, however,*[6] *and there are fundamental differences between the two scenes. Aeschylus's Cassandra 'sees' far more than the murder of Agamemnon, and so long as she in her trance (*Ag. *1072–1177) she is completely unresponsive to the questions of the bewildered chorus. Here she is supposed to alternate between trance and engagement with Priam, the chorus and Deiphobus,*[7] *and they are supposed to understand and believe what she tells them. It is difficult to see what purpose was served by transforming the Iliadic narrative of the combat watched from the walls of Troy into an event experienced less immediately in this way. Much depends on the assumption that in lines 1–2 Priam is trying to calm an ecstatic Cassandra and that in 11–19 Deiphobus is right in thinking she is out of her mind, but Deiphobus's reaction is best seen as mistaken and lines 1–2 must in fact be addressed by Priam to Hector (see the notes on these passages).*

If Cassandra is actually seeing the combat, how could the scene have been staged? Ferrari (29f.) supposes that Priam and the chorus are with her and can all see the combat, but their comments in lines 5–7 do not necessarily imply this and a whole tragic chorus could hardly have been imagined as assembled with Cassandra on the city walls. As Medda (59f.) points out, Deiphobus's entrance ***from the palace*** *must mean that the* skênê *represented the palace with the main acting area set in front of it. He infers that actors and chorus are all on this level with no view of the combat (so Cassandra must be seeing it in a vision) and rejects the possibility that Cassandra speaks from a higher level (i.e. the* skênê *roof) and can see the combat while the others cannot. His arguments against this possibility are not compelling,*[8] *and I think it is the most*

---

[5] Coles leaned towards this view. Gentili proposed it in detail, followed by Kannicht–Snell in *TrGF* 2, Mazzoldi, Catenacci, Kotlińska-Toma, Liapis, Jackson and others.

[6] 13 ἔα· τί λεύσσω ~ *Ag.* 1125 ἆ ἆ ἰδοὺ ἰδού; 14 αἰνίγματός μοι μείζον' ἐφθέγξω λόγον ~ *Ag.* 1112f. νῦν γὰρ ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων . . . ἀμηχανῶ; 17 μέμηνας αὐτὴ καὶ παρεπλάγχθης φρένα ~ *Ag.* 1140 φρενομανής τις εἶ θεοφόρητος. There are metrical similarities only if lines 4–10 etc. are short lyric phrases (cf. Gentili 70ff.).

[7] Taplin suggests this was an ingenious innovation (2009, 260f.).

[8] Medda (60) argues that 'the omission of the subjects in the sentences of lines 4 and 6 . . . is far more understandable in the case of a seer absorbed in her vision', and that this reconstruction does not 'take adequately into account the motive of

likely option; the similarity with Antigone viewing the Argive army in Euripides' Phoenissae *has often been noted. Whether Priam is with Cassandra and can also see the combat is less clear. Lines 1–2 (**Take courage etc.**), if addressed to Hector, suggest but do not quite prove that he can. Line 5 (**Who, my child . . . ?**) addressed to Cassandra suggests that he cannot, but this could be because, like the paidagogos in* Phoenissae, *the old man cannot see clearly enough. The Iliadic precedents perhaps make it more likely that he is with Cassandra.*

The nature of the text is uncertain. The papyrus is from the late first or early second century AD, and some of its language suggests a Hellenistic or post-Hellenistic origin (the details are summarized by Medda 72–74; cf. below on 1–2, 6–7, 10, 11, 16). The repeated instruction for

Πριαμ. θάρσησον, ὦ παῖ· μὴ κάμῃς· στῆσον πόδα
καὶ σαῖσι β[ο]υλαῖς προσδέχου τὰ κρείσσ[ονα.
ᾠδή
Κασσ. βέβληκε δεινὸν κάμακα·
Πρ. τίς, τέκνον; φράσον· Χο. ὁ Πηλιώτης[5
———
Κα. ἀλλ' ἠστόχησε<ν>. Χο. εἶπας ὡς ἔχει[
Κα. Ἕκτωρ †δεδεμλει†. Χο. δυστυχὴς ἀγὼ[ν
Κα. ἴσως ἐδυστύχησε{ν}.
———
ᾠδή
κοινὰ μέχρι νῦν νικῶμεν· . [10
———
Δηιφ. τίς ἦχ[ο]ς ἡμᾶς ἐκ δόμων ἀνέκλαγε;

madness in the words of Deiphobus at line 17' (but see 11–19 n.). Medda also argues (56f.) that Deiphobus could not have heard Cassandra's cries from within the palace, but that is not implausible if she is on the palace (*skênê*) roof.

some of Cassandra's lines to be sung suggests it may have been a performer's copy — but of what? On Gentili's interpretation this is an example of a Hellenistic tragedy.[9] *Others have suggested that it might not be from a whole tragedy but rather a piece composed for concert or mime performance (Fantuzzi–Hunter, Easterling), or even just a 'curiosity of amateur dramatics' (Taplin 1977a, 127). Medda argues that the references to remote space and sounds (the battlefield, Deiphobus hearing a clamour from inside the palace, Hector's death-cry) suggest a text designed for a theatrical setting. This may well be true of the text in its original form, while the purpose of the adapted text (as detected by Ferrari) cannot be precisely defined.*

Priam. Take courage, my child, do not flag. Stand firm, and accept the better course for your planning!

Cassandra (singing):

He has cast his terrible spear . . .

Priam. Who, my child? Tell me!

Chorus. The Peliote . . . . . .[5]

Cass. . . . but missed his mark.

Cho. You have told it as *(I wish it to be?).*

Cass. *(And?)* Hector . . . *(text corrupt)* . . .

Cho. . . . contest . . . unsuccessful . . .

Cass. He too was unsuccessful:

(singing) So far we share the victory —

Cho. . . . *(a phrase lost)* . . .[10]

Deiphobus (entering). What clamour has called me from the palace?

---

[9] Fernández Galiano (1978) suggested a tragedy of Lycophron on the basis of some inadequate lexical comparisons with the *Alexandra* (and assuming the tragedian and the *Alexandra* poet were identical). Taplin (2009, 2014) argues for a pre-Hellenistic date and a possible connection with Astydamas's *Hector*, but his case depends on identifying the Cassandra of this papyrus with the ecstatic Cassandra of the Berlin vase and on assuming that the vase represents Astydamas's play (cf. above, pp. 36f.). As Taplin accepts, it is difficult to accommodate both a scene in which Cassandra and others experience the fatal duel as it happens and a speech reporting it as in the Strasbourg papyrus (Astydamas **F 2a**); moreover, these accounts contradict each other, reversing the order in which the heroes cast their spears as Coles (112) noted. For linguistic and metrical objections to a fourth-century date see most recently Liapis 2016, 82–84.

ᾠδή

⟨Κα.⟩ {ἔα} ἔα· τί λεύσ<σ>ω; [

Δη. αἰνίγ[ματό]ς μοι μείζον᾽ ἐφθέγξω λόγο[ν·

B *ᾠδή* 15

⟨Κα.⟩ ο̣[ὐ]κ ε̣ἶ πρὸ πύργων; ο̣ὐκ[ ]σε [

Δη. μ̣έ̣μ̣η̣ν̣α̣[ς] αὐτὴ καὶ παρεπλάγχθης φρένα[

ᾠδή

⟨Κα.⟩ οὐ παρε̣κ̣έ̣[λ]ευε̣ς; [

⟨Δη.?⟩ πατ . . . τ . . . . . ατο̣[. . . . .] . [20

ὃς ν̣ῦ̣[ν] ε . . . . ρο ι̣ο̣σ̣[

ᾠδή

Κα. ν̣ε̣[ώ]τ̣ερόν μοι τ[

⟨— ?⟩ ἀκού[σ]α̣[τ᾽] ἄ[κ]ρ̣αν γῆρυν [

⟨— ?⟩ ἀκού[σ]α̣θ̣᾽· ῎Ε̣κ̣τ̣ω̣ρ ἐξόλωλ[ ] [25

ᾠδή

⟨Κα.⟩ ἀχ̣λ̣ύς ποθ̣εν με[

ὄ̣λ̣ω̣λ̣[ε] . . . α̣ι̣ κα̣ὶ φάος Τιτα̣[

. . . [.] . . [.] . δ ν̣ῦ̣ν τὸ κλεινὸ̣[ν Ἴλιον

τῆς σῆς ἔρη[μ]ο̣ν̣ χειρὸς Ἑλλή[νων 30

βαλεῖ πρὸς οὖδας.

———

⟨Πρ.?⟩ ν]ῦν δ[ὲ] δ̣[υσ]τ̣υ̣χὴς ἐγώ.

]λλ [.] . . α̣ . ρ̣[. σ]κ̣ῆπτ̣ρ̣[

⟨*ᾠδή?*⟩

traces of one more line 35

6 ἔχει[ν θέλω Barrett 7 δὲ μέλλει (or βάλλει) Coles ἀγὼ[ν ὅδε Coles (δοκεῖ Ferrari) ἀγω[νία Stephanopoulos 8 ἐδυστύχησε{ν} Ferrari 10 Χ̣[ο(ρός)? Kannicht 13 {ἔα} Coles 16 ο̣[ὐ]κ ε̣ἶ Kannicht end ο̣ὐκ̣ [ἔ]σει [σοφός; Snell ο̣ὐκ̣ [ἔ]σει [σώφρων μανείς Ferrari (μανείς Kannicht) 17 φρένα or φρένα[ς Coles 21 ὃς ν̣ῦ̣[ν] Kannicht 23 ν̣ε̣[ώ]τ̣ερόν Kannicht 24 ἀκού[σ]α̣[τ᾽] ἄ̣[κ]ρ̣αν Snell 25 ἀκού[σ]α̣θ̣᾽· ῎Ε̣κ̣τ̣ω̣ρ uncertainly Coles 27 μέ[λαινα? Ferrari 28 ΤΕΙΤΑ̣[P. Oxy. Τιτά̣[νιον? Kannicht 29 ν̣ῦ̣ν and end Kannicht 30 end e.g. στρατός Coles, βία Kannicht, στόλος Ferrari 31 possibly βάλλει (second λ superscript) Coles 32 ν]ῦν δ̣[ὲ] δ̣[υσ]τ̣υ̣χὴς Ferrari (δ̣[υσ]τ̣υ̣χὴς uncertainly Coles)

Cass. (singing):

Ah – what am I seeing? . . . *(a phrase lost)* . . .

Deiph. What you have said is more than a riddle to me.

Cass. (singing):

You are not before the walls? . . . . . *not* . . . . . ?

Deiph. You are raving yourself, your mind has become deranged!

Cass. (singing):

You were not encouraging him? . . . (*a phrase lost*) . . .

(Two lines, speaker uncertain, with only Who now . . . *legible)*[21]

Cass. (singing):

. . . *(something)* new . . . to me . . .

(speaker uncertain) Hear that piercing cry . . . . . .

(another speaker?) Hear it! *Hector* . . . . . has perished.[25]

Cass. (singing):

A mist from somewhere . . . . . .

(speaking) (He) has perished, and the *Sun-god's* light . . . . . Now glorious Troy, bereft of your arm, will be cast to the ground by the . . . of the Greeks.[31]

(Priam?) . . . . . *(ill-)*fortuned am I . . . . . *sceptre* . . . . . .

(further singing from Cassandra?)

Notes on adesp. F 649

1–2. Take courage . . . **stand firm . . . accept the better course:** the language strongly suggests that Priam is addressing Hector (Ferrari 28), not an ecstatic Cassandra as Gentili asserted (translating implausibly, 'with the resources of your wisdom meet the stronger force (of your prophetic power)'.[10] In *Iliad* 22.37ff. Priam pleads with Hector *not* to stand and face Achilles, but that was when Hector still had the option of retreating into the city. Our text describes their final confrontation, and now Priam urges Hector to stand and defend

[10] Gentili 66, cf. Catenacci 100f., Liapis 78 ('with the power of your reason face what is overwhelming'). Medda 64 suggests that Cassandra may have 'manifested the intention to perform some self-harming action', and that Priam 'reacts by exhorting her to take the better course in her decisions'.

himself. **στῆσον πόδα** (lit. 'set your foot') may well imply 'don't run' (or 'stop running' as in Eur. *Hel.* 554, *Bacch.* 647). The words then echo ironically the deceptive advice of Athena (impersonating Deiphobus) to Hector in *Iliad* 22.231, ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ στέωμεν etc. (cf. Hector to Achilles, νῦν αὖτέ με θυμὸς ἀνῆκε | στήμεναι ἀντία σεῖο, 22.252f.). Cassandra will have described that moment just before our fragment begins. **[θάρσησον, ὦ παῖ:** as in Ezechiel, *Exagôgê* 100 (see note there; θάρσησον is apparently postclassical.**]**

4–10. On the layout and structure of the text see above, pp. 371f. Ferrari analyzes the passage as six iambic trimeters (βέβληκε . . . , ὁ Πηλιώτης . . . , ἀλλ' ἠστόχησε<ν> . . . , Ἕκτωρ . . . , ἴσως . . . , νικῶμεν . . .) with the inset phrases set to be sung.

5a. Who, my child? Priam is probably with Cassandra but cannot see the action clearly enough (above, pp. 373f.).

5b. The Peliote . . . : i.e. Achilles, raised on Mount Pelion by the centaur Cheiron. The word **Πηλιώτης** (otherwise cited only by grammarians, but cf. Πηλιῶτις, Eur. *Med.* 484) replaces Achilles' Homeric epithet Πηληϊάδης 'son of Peleus' but also recalls that this **terrible spear** is the one that 'Achilles alone could wield, the Pelian spear (Πηλιάδα μελίην) that Cheiron once furnished from Pelion's peak for his dear father, to bring death to heroes' (*Iliad* 16.142–4: cf. Catenacci 97). Patroclus did not take it into battle because he could not wield it, so Hector has not taken it from him with the rest of Achilles' armour. In *Iliad* 22.130–3 it is Achilles' approach 'brandishing . . . his terrible (δεινήν) Pelian spear' that causes Hector to panic and flee. The Chorus's words here might have been a question supplementing Priam's ('Was it the Peliote . . . ?') or a comment on Achilles' terrible power; either way, their interjection is enough to confirm that the spear of line 4 is his. **[**Coles 116 suggested attributing these words to Cassandra, but her lines make good sense as they stand.**]**

6–7. Almost certainly iambic trimeters rather than short lyric phrases as in Gentili's analysis. **εἶπας ὡς ἔχει** as a complete sentence is vacuous ('You've told it like it is'), especially when the Chorus does not know how it is. Barrett's **ὡς ἔχει[ν θέλω**, **as *I wish it to be*** is the best of several suggested supplements. For the meaningless **†δεδεμλει†** the conjectures in the apparatus give 'And Hector is preparing (to cast)' or 'is casting' (Coles, Medda). Those for the completion of 7b all give similar sense ('The/*this* contest *(is/seems)* unsuccessful'), but this could be a question which Cassandra then answers. **[missed his mark:** the verb ἀστοχέω is prosaic and post-classical. ἄστοχος and ἀστόχως are (*contra* Medda 73) rare in 4th C. authors (ἄστοχος Plato 1x, Aristotle 1x, ἀστόχως Alexis 2x).**]**

10. So far we share the victory: lit. 'We win in common up to now'; Hector is on level terms with Achilles. **[**For adverbial κοινά cf. Soph. *Aj.* 577, *Ant.* 546, Eur. *IT* 668. The phrase μέχρι νῦν is prosaic, normally in historical contexts (conjectured in Ar. *Frogs* 1256: Medda 73).**]** The trace at the right margin looks like a large letter X as for the Chorus (Xo.) in lines 5–7.

11–19. The language of this section does not imply that Cassandra is in an ecstatic state. Her reaction is rational in the circumstances: she thinks she has just seen Deiphobus with Hector and now sees him before her in the city (cf. Ferrari 30f.). She has presumably tried to explain this in the words now lost at the right margins of lines 13, 16 and 19. Deiphobus cannot make sense of it and jumps to the conclusion that she is suffering one of her mantic fits. The exchange would be pointless if that were actually the case.

11. What clamour has called me etc.: Deiphobus enters from the palace (presumably the theatrical *skênê*: above, p. 373). **[**The word **ἦχος** is not found elsewhere in tragedy except adesp. F 680a.23 (Hellenistic), nor in other pre-Hellenistic poetry (earliest Menand. *Sicyon*. 199). Transitive ἀνακλάζω is unique.**]**

16. You are not before the walls? In this context **εἶ** must be the present tense of εἰμί. Ferrari (31) takes it as the future of εἶμι ('Won't you go?', i.e. to rejoin the combat), but the fact that οὐκ εἶ commonly has that sense is irrelevant. The lost phrase following this prompts the reply 'You *yourself* are raving', so it presumably reproached Deiphobus in some way, e.g. *Will you not be sensible when you are (now) raving?* Ferrari, app. crit.). **[**Active παρακελεύω is not attested before Polybius 7.16.2, cf. Medda 74.**]**

19b–21. Presumably Cassandra presses her question and Deiphobus makes it clear that he has not been with Hector. The focus then moves to the cry from the battlefield.

23. ***(something)*** **new:** in this context new and sinister.

24f. Hear that piercing cry: Hector's death-cry is heard from afar, like Aegisthus's in Eur. *El.* 747ff. where γῆρυς (any kind of utterance) similarly refers to a death-cry (*El.* 754). **ἄ[κ]ραν** is lit. 'topmost', 'extremely high' (hardly 'den Gipfel der Kunde', *MusTr* or 'final cry', Medda 62). The speaker(s) can only be guessed (see e.g. Ferrari 34, Liapis 79, Medda 63).

27. Cassandra's sung words may recall the description of Andromache fainting on hearing of Hector's death in *Iliad* 22.466f., 'Dark night (ἐρεβεννὴ νύξ) veiled her eyes etc.'. Ferrari therefore suggests **ἀχλὺς . . . μέ[λαινα**, 'A dark mist . . . '.

28–31. (He) has perished etc.: probably spoken by Cassandra, with Priam responding in 33f. The ***Sun-god*** (accepting Kannicht's Τιτά[νιον) is the Titan Helios, cf. p. 363 on Ezechiel, *Exagôgê* 217. The adjective is mentioned by grammarians but is scarcely found elsewhere.

32–33. The paragraphus above line 32 and the word ***sceptre*** in 33 make it very likely that Priam is the speaker. On Ferrari's interpretation line 32 completes the trimeter begun in line 31.

Adesp. F 644
Lament of Andromache

Text. Oxford, Bodleian Library inv. Gr. class. f. 113 (P) (1st C. AD), ed. Lobel 1936 with photo; Page 1941, 163–66 (col. 2); *TrGF* 2.211–13 with *addenda* 5.1134, cf. *MusTr* 248–51.

Discussions. Morel 1937; Kamerbeek 1938; Körte 1939, 100–2; von Blumenthal 1942, 62–64; Webster 1954, 299f.; Calder 1966, 50f.; Xanthakis–Karamanos 1980, 42–44.

The papyrus, written in the first century AD, contains two columns of 21 lines each, the first with line-ends only, the second complete but for a few letters missing at the ends of most lines. Lines 1–19 were iambic trimeters. The rest (col. 1.20–21 and all of col. 2) are anapaestic dimeters (recitative rather than sung) written so that most of them spill over from one line to the next (the papyrus's line-breaks are marked by | in the text below as in TrGF*).*

Little can be said about the content of lines 1–19 except that it was a dialogue (γύναι 'woman' vocative, 7; a colon marking a speaker-change at the end of 14) and that it led up to what follows, a lament of Andromache for her husband Hector. Andromache, then, is the 'woman' of line 7, the son in 46 is Astyanax, and the other speaker in 1–19 may be one of her captors, perhaps Talthybius as in Euripides' Trojan Women*. The lament is structured in segments, each closed by a paroemiac (catalectic anapaestic dimeter) with a paragraphus marking the break in the papyrus:*

20–26 the impact of Hector's loss;
27–33 Andromache's grief and destitution;
34–43 Troy's destruction caused by Helen's adultery, its own girls and women enslaved;
44–49 departure with Astyanax (incomplete, probably ending the lament).

It is generally assumed that the scene was set at Hector's tomb, but it seems equally possible that it was at the Greek camp with the mother and son setting off towards the tomb in lines 44–49.[1] *Kannicht in the*

[1] For the setting at the tomb see e.g. Kamerbeek 346, Körte 101, Webster 299, Calder 51, Xanthakis-Karamanos 44, *MusTr* 248. The idea that Andromache

TrGF *apparatus suggested that a scene including an anapaestic monody would have occurred near the beginning or the end of the play (associated with the parodos or exodos as often in Euripides), but other moments are possible for an actor's anapaests, especially those accompanying movement to or from the stage.*[2]

Lobel thought the text probably post-Euripidean on lexical grounds,[3] *and this seems to be confirmed by apparent reminiscences of Euripides'* Trojan Women *and other plays.*[4] *It could be not much later, however. Morel thought of Antiphon's* Andromache *as the source of this fragment and the model for Ennius's* Andromacha*, which was set at Troy and included both a lament of* Andromache *and a report of Astyanax's death. Webster linked Antiphon with this fragment and with Accius's* Astyanax*,*[5] *which concerned Andromache's vain attempt to save her son by hiding him in the countryside. The links with Antiphon are in my opinion mistaken since his play can hardly have been set at Troy (see above, pp. 14f.). The fragment could be from a play known to Ennius and/or Accius, but the material and language of the lament are too familiar for any such connection to be verifiable.*[6]

---

then took Astyanax away into hiding (Kamerbeek with further speculations, Webster, Xanthakis-Karamanos) is an invention based on the hypothesis that this play was the source of Accius's *Astyanax*.

[2] Cf. *Alc.* 861–925 (Admetus returning from his wife's funeral), *Tro.* 782–98 (Talthybius and Hecuba as Astyanax is led to his death). Creusa's monody at *Ion* 859–922 is partly recitative and partly sung anapaests.

[3] ἐστέρεσεν (25) is abnormal (usually ἐστέρησεν), anticipated only in *Odyssey* 13.262 στερέσαι. βλαβερός 'harmful' (26) is common in 4th-century Attic prose (Isocrates, Xenophon, Plato) but anticipated in poetry only in Hes. *Works* 365 (= *Hom.Hymn.* 4.36) where West suggests it means 'subject to harm'. μακαριστότατος (37) is also prosaic (Xenophon and Isocrates once each, -τερος Isocrates once; μακαριστός twice in Aristophanes, then in Hellenistic poetry). It should be noted however that these are all to some extent products of the anapaestic metre.

[4] See the notes below on lines 22, 27, 30, 38f., 40, 47.

[5] Webster 1954, 299f. Kamerbeek (345) had suggested linking the fragment with Accius.

[6] Cf. Scafoglio 2006, 47f., 71. Other possibly relevant titles are Iophon's *Iliou Persis* (see Vol. 1, Iophon **T 1**) and Nicomachus's *Persis* (see Nicomachus **T 1** with p. 306 n. 2 above). There is no good reason to consider Sophocles' *Polyxena* (»» Calder 1966, 50f., also questioning the attribution of our fragment to Antiphon).

col. 1 *1–19, line-ends from an iambic dialogue, a few words preserved (*1 τάφον?, 5 χώρας ἄπο, 7 γύναι, 9 πάλιν, 14 λιτάς, 15 μοι *or* ἐμοί, 16 χοάς*), then one anapaestic dimeter wholly lost* (20), *then anapaests (* | *marks line-ends in the papyrus, col. 1 ends at* ὄνο-*):*

μόνον, ἀλλ᾽ ε|[(⏑) – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – 21

(col. 2) ⏑ ⏑ – (⏑) τέ]κ̣νων ὄνο|μ᾽ ἥδιστον
καὶ δῶμα φίλον το[(⏑) – ⏑ ⏑ – |]
τὸ δ᾽ ἴσον καὶ ἐμοί ποτε νυμφίδ[ιον
λέχος |] ἐστέρεσεν 25
φθόνος ἢ βλαβερὰ . [⏑ ⏑ – – |]
τί γὰρ ἡ τλήμων πάθος οὐκ ἀ̣ν̣[τλῶ |]
φρεσίν; ἦ γὰ̣[ρ] ἐμ̣αῖ̣ς ἐπὶ δυστυχ[ίαις
⏑ ⏑ – |] π̣ελανὸς προλέλοιπε γόων
. [⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – |] φθιμένου μελέα 30
σέθεν, Ἕκτορ, [⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ |] πάτρ̣αι
καὶ ἐμοὶ μέγα φῶς·
ἅμα σ[οὶ ⏑ ⏑ – |] ὄ̣λετ᾽ ὄλβος.
one verse nearly all lost
[κ]τεάνων τε δ[*c. 12 letters*]με[| 35
θάλαμόν τ᾽ ὀ̣[λο]ῶι πυρὶ δ̣α̣[ιόμ]εν[ον
καὶ |] πρίν ποτε δ[ὴ] μ̣ακαριστότατον
Π[ριάμου |] μέλαθρον [στε]φάνας θ᾽ ἱερὰς
χθ̣ο̣[νὸς Ἰδαίας |], διὰ δ᾽ οὐχ ὅ[σιον]
λέχος αἰνογάμου . [⏑ ⏑ – |] Ἑλένης 40
ἀδ[όκ]ητα κόραις καὶ ἀ . . . [α |] κλύειν
ἅμ[α Τρ]ωϊάσιν δέμνι᾽ Ἀχαιῶ̣[ν
⏑ ⏑ – |] παρὰ ναυσὶ[. .]χούσαις.
ἀλλ᾽ ἐπιτ[– – |] τύμβοισι μ . [. (.)]ην
τὰς σὰς θρηνεῖν [δύστη]ν̣ε τύχας· 45
[. . .] . νε τέκνον, στεῖχε .[(⏑) – – |]
βάσιν εὐθύν[ω]ν μετὰ μητρὸς ὁ̣μ[οῦ
τῆς |] γειναμένη[ς· π]οῖ μ᾽ ὦ φιλί̣[α]
Τρώω̣[ν |

23 το[κέων? Stephanopoulos 26 ν̣[έμεσις θεῶν Kamerbeek 29 ἤδη] Snell νῦν δὴ] Page οἴμοι] Morel 30 ο̣[ἷς ἔγκειμαι] Kamerbeek 31 [ἐγώ, σὺ γὰρ ἦσθα] Maas *ap.* Morel, Kamerbeek 33 σύμπας] Morel, Körte γὰρ ἅπας] *or* δ᾽ ἡμῖν] Snell χἠμῖν]

(col. 1) ends of eighteen dialogue lines including 1 tomb *or* burial?, 5 from (this) land, 7 woman *(voc.*), 9 again, 14 prayers, 15 to/for me, 16 libations, *then beginning of an anapaestic lament:*

. . . *(one line wholly lost)* . . . [20] alone, . . . *(col. 2)* but . . . sweetest name of *children* and dear *(parents'?)* house . . . and that bridal *(bed)* which was once equally mine the resentment or harmful *(indignation of the gods?)* has made bereft.[26]

What mental suffering *(do I)* not *(drain)* in my affliction? Truly the libation of cries at my misfortunes *(in which I am immersed?)* has *(by now?)* run dry, forlorn *(as I am?)* with your passing,[30] Hector, *(for you were?)* a great light for your father-land and for me; with *you (all our?)* prosperity is gone.

. . . . . *(one line lost)* and(?) . . . . . of *(its?)* possessions . . . . . .[35] and our chamber *wasted* by *destroying* fire, *(and Priam's)* once most blessed palace, and the sacred *crowns (of Ida's) land*, and through the un*(holy)* union of ill-wedded Helen . . .[40] things *unimaginable* and *un(. . .)* to hear for our maidens and for the women of Troy, *having (*or *having been allotted?)* beds by the Achaeans' *(hollow?)* ships.

But . . . . . to lament your fate *(at your?)* tomb, *(unhappy one).*[45] . . . my son, make your way . . . stepping straight forward *together with (the)* mother who bore you. *Whither* . . . me, dear *(land?)* of the Trojans . . .

Kamerbeek δ' οἴκων] Page 41 ἄτ . . [Lobel ἄτιμ[α Kamerbeek, Page (doubted by Lobel *ap.* Page) ἄπισ[τα] West, *TrGF* 5.1134 (declined by Lobel) 43 κοίλαις] Körte ναυσὶ[ν ἐ]χούσαις Lobel ναυσὶ [λα]χούσαις Kannicht 44 ἐπὶ τ[οῖς σοῖς] Page μό̣[ν]ην Lobel ('seems too short' Kannicht) με̣ [χρ]ῆν Snell ('too long', Kannicht) 46 στεῖχε Ἀ[στύαναξ 'possible', Page 47 ὁ̣μ[οῦ τῆς] Maas *ap.* Morel ὁ̣μ[ῶς οὐ Lobel 49 Τρώω[ν χώρα Körte

Notes on adesp. F 644

22. the sweetest name of children: i.e. 'ones with that sweetest of names, 'children'', cf. Eur. *IT* 905 τὸ κλεινὸν ὄνομα τῆς σωτηρίας, 'that thing with the renowned name 'salvation''. **[**Eur. *Pho.* 1702 and *Or.* 1045f. have been compared but we should probably read ὄμμα for ὄνομα in *Pho.* 1702 and *Or.* 1046 is more seriously corrupt (though ὄνομα could be right there).**]**

23. dear *(parents?)* house: for his supplement **το[κέων** Stephanopoulos compared Eur. *Tro.* 201 (Chorus) νέατον τοκέων δώματα λεύσσω, 'for the last time I see my parents' house'.

26. the resentment or harmul *(indignation of the gods?)*: Kamerbeek's **ν[έμεσις θεῶν** is very probable. For the gods' ***indignation*** (νέμεσις) cf. [Hesiod] fr. 70.27 M–W = 41.27 Most, Hdt. 1.34, Soph. *Phil.* 518f., 602f., Eur. *Or.* 1361f.; for their **resentment** (φθόνος) e.g. Aesch. *Pers*. 362, Hdt. 4.205, Eur. *Alc.* 1135, *Supp*. 348*,* Thuc. 7.77.3; **harm** (βλάβη) from gods, Soph. *Ant*. 1104, Eur. *Ion* 520.

27. What mental suffering do I not *(drain)*: ἀγ[τλῶ (Lobel) makes a frequent tragic metaphor for enduring suffering or distress (ἄντλος is a ship's bilgewater): »» LSJ 'ἀντλέω' II.2; also ἐξαντλέω (Eur. 6x), ὑπεξαντλέω (Eur. *Ion* 927 κακῶν . . . κῦμ' ὑπεξαντλῶν φρενί).

29. my libation of cries: an unusual metaphor. ***πελανός*** is a viscous liquid such as blood, honey or the mixture of wheat-meal, oil and honey used for libations: »» LSJ 'πελανός', Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 96.

30. cries . . . *(in which I am immersed?)*: Kamerbeek's **o[ἷς ἔγκειμαι]** is plausible (lit. 'in which I lie'). He compared Eur. *Andr.* 91–93 οἷσπερ ἐγκείμεσθ' ἀεὶ | θρήνοισι καὶ γόοισι etc. ('the laments and cries . . . in which I am continually immersed'), *IT* 144f. δυσθρηνήτοις . . . θρήνοις ἔγκειμαι.

31f. a great light for your fatherland etc.: φῶς connotes both the glory and the protective power which the hero bestows on his homeland and family, e.g. Pind. *Pyth* 4.270 (Arcesilas of Cyrene), Eur. *El.* 449 (Achilles), *HF* 797 (Heracles).

33. *(all our?)* prosperity: or *'for us'* (Snell), *'for us too'* (Kamerbeek), *'your house's'* (Page).

34–43. This was probably a single impassioned period with a main verb in line 34 such as 'I/we have witnessed/suffered etc.', though there could have been a second main verb in line 40 (see below).

36. ὀλοῶι πυρὶ δαιόμενον, wasted by destroying fire: epic phrasing, especially in the *Iliad* (13.628 πῦρ ὀλοόν, 15.605 ὀλοὸν πῦρ, δήϊον πῦρ 4x, πυρὸς δηΐοιο 5x), also *Odyssey* 12.67 πυρός τ' ὀλοοῖο, Ap. Rhod. 1.243 αὐτῆμάρ κε δόμους ὀλοῷ πυρὶ δηώσειαν Αἰήτεω ('They might destroy Aietes' palace with destructive fire in a single day'). In tragedy Eur. *Andr.* 105 (Troy) δορὶ καὶ πυρὶ δηΐάλωτον, *Tro.* 825 ἁ δέ σε γειναμένα πυρὶ δαίεται ('She [Troy] who bore you [Ganymede] is being destroyed by fire').

38f. the sacred crowns of *(Ida's)* land: i.e. the battlements of Troy, cf. Eur. *Hec.* 910 (Chorus) ἀπὸ δὲ στεφάναν κέκαρσαι πύργων ('You have had the crown of your battlements shorn'), *Tro.* 782–85 (Talthybius to Astyanax) βαῖνε πατρῴων πύργων ἐπ' ἄκρας στεφάνας ('go onto the topmost crown(s) of your ancestral walls'). Greek city-protecting goddesses were often depicted wearing mural crowns (i.e. crowns shaped as battlements).

40. αἰνογάμου . . . Ἑλένης, ill-wedded Helen: cf. Eur. *Hel*. 1120 Πάρις αἰνόγαμος, Aesch. *Ag.* 713 Paris αἰνόλεκτρος, 'ill-bedded', Lycophr. *Alex.* 820 Helen αἰνόλεκτρος. **[**For the gap in this verse Page suggested περίεσθ', 'there remain (things unimaginable etc.)', but a verb is probably not necessary (see above on 34–43). A second adjective qualifying Helen (e.g. στυγερᾶς 'hateful', Kamerbeek) seems superfluous.**]**

41. *un(. . .)* to hear: something like ἄπιστα 'unbelievable' or ἄτιμα 'dishonourable' is needed, although Lobel doubted both (see app.: ἄτλητα 'unbearable' and ἄτερπνα 'unpleasing' cannot be read).

42f. beds by the Achaeans' *(hollow?)* ships: i.e. their assignment to the Greek leaders as concubines (see esp. Eur. *Tro.* 197–229). ***hollow* ships** is a common Homeric formula.

44f. But . . . to lament your fate etc.: the sentence needs a verb which is hard to find.

47. stepping straight forward: βάσιν εὐθύνων is lit. 'straightening your step', cf. Eur. *Hcld.* 728 εὐθύνων πόδα, *Hipp.* 1227 εὐθύνοι δρόμον.

Adesp. F 664
Gyges

Text. P. Oxy. 23.2382 (2nd–3rd C. AD), ed. Lobel 1949 and 1956 (*Ox. Pap.* vol. 23); *TrGF* 2.248–51 with *addenda* 5.1136f., cf. *MusTr* 260–63, 303; Diggle 1998, 182 (col. 2). Image at POxy: Oxyrhynchus Online.

Discussions. Maas 1950; Latte 1950; Kakridis 1951; Page 1951a; Kamerbeek 1952; Gigante 1952; Cantarella 1952; Lesky 1953, 1977; Raubitschek 1955; Cataudella 1957; Snell 1973; Holzberg 1973; Marini 1992; Garzya 1993; Xanthakis-Karamanos 1997, 1041–45; Griffin 2006; Kotlińska-Toma 2015, 178–85; Hornblower 2019, 103–5.

The papyrus, written in the second or third century AD, contains what seems to be part of a tragedy concerning Gyges' murder of his predecessor Candaules and accession to the throne of Lydia, founding the Mermnad dynasty around 680 BC. There is no other evidence for such a tragedy.[1] *The papyrus contains the lower parts of three columns with fifteen line-ends from the first column, most of the last sixteen lines of the second, and fourteen line-beginnings from near the foot of the third. The numbers of lines missing from the upper parts of each column are unknown.*

In Greek literature Gyges was a byword for wealth (already in his own time: Archilochus fr. 19 IEG*) and for the ring of invisibility which according to Plato (*Republic *2. 359d–360e) helped him seduce the king's wife, murder her husband and seize the kingdom. A different account of his accession, derived from the fifth-century* Lydian History *of Xanthus, is found in Nicolaus of Damascus* FGrH *90 F 47, but our*

[1] Lobel saw a possible allusion to this tragedy in Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon* 1.8.5, a suggestion approved by e.g. Maas 143, Kakridis 4, Gigante 6f., Holzberg 202 n. 9. There is no real basis for this. In his diatribe against destructive women Clinias first lists 'stories of women that have filled the stage', i.e. women best known from classic tragedies for their crimes of betrayal or revenge (Eriphyle, Philomela, Stheneboea, Aerope, Procne), then women whose beauty proved fatal to men or cities (Chryseis, Briseis, Candaules' wife, Helen, Penelope) or who who killed men they loved (Phaedra) or did not love (Clytemnestra). Only the first group is explicitly linked with tragedy.

fragment essentially coincides with the story told by Herodotus (1.8–12). According to this, Candaules was so infatuated with his wife's beauty that he persuaded Gyges, his favourite bodyguard, to watch her undressing for bed while hiding behind the door of his bedchamber. Gyges did as he was told,

> ὡς δὲ κατὰ νώτου ἐγένετο ἰούσης τῆς γυναικὸς ἐς τὴν κοίτην, ὑπεκδὺς ἐχώρεε ἔξω. καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἐπορᾷ μιν ἐξιόντα. μαθοῦσα δὲ τὸ ποιηθὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς οὔτε ἀνέβωσε αἰσχυνθεῖσα οὔτε ἔδοξε μαθεῖν, ἐν νόῳ ἔχουσα τείσασθαι τὸν Κανδαύλεα . . . . τότε μὲν δὴ οὕτως οὐδὲν δηλώσασα ἡσυχίην εἶχε· ὡς δὲ ἡμέρη τάχιστα ἐγεγόνεε, τῶν οἰκετέων τοὺς μάλιστα ὥρα πιστοὺς ἐόντας ἑωυτῇ ἑτοίμους ποιησαμένη ἐκάλεε τὸν Γύγεα . . .
>
> And once he was behind the woman's back as she went towards the bed, he slipped out of hiding and left. And the woman caught sight of him leaving. Realizing what her husband had brought about, she neither cried out at being shamed nor showed that she realized it, having in mind to make Candaules pay . . . . Thus for the moment she revealed nothing and held her peace; but as soon as day came she prepared those of the servants whom she saw to be most loyal to her and summoned Gyges . . . .

The Queen then offered Gyges a choice, either to kill Candaules and take his place or to be killed himself. Gyges chose survival and with the Queen's help hid in the bedchamber again, killed Candaules in his sleep and seized the throne.

In column 2 of the papyrus the Queen relates the events of the night as in Herodotus, but from her point of view and with some more detail: she first feared an assassination attempt but then saw that Candaules was still awake and must have known what was going on; she spent an anxious night planning what to do; she roused Candaules before dawn and sent him off to his regal duties. In the last line of this column she seems to be saying she has sent someone to summon Gyges, and the remnants in column 3 might be part of a dialogue between the two of them (or between her and a confidant). In column 1 she almost certainly introduces the speech which continues in column 2 (13, ***I shall tell the whole tale****), and it is usually supposed that she says this to the chorus who are then the* ***companions*** *(17) who have greeted her in the preceding lines (see note below on 6–17); this would be happening after the parodos, presumably in Episode 1. But the text in column 1 could all*

belong to the Queen, with lines 7–10 referring to her asking the gods for their support, in which case this could have been the prologue speech.

Attempts to reconstruct the play's plot have usually assumed that it corresponded closely with Herodotus's narrative, as the content of the Queen's speech clearly does.[2] *It would then have included Candaules' persuasion of Gyges, either enacted or related by the king (Hdt. 1.8–9), the Queen's account of the night's events (Hdt. 1.10–11.1), her interview with Gyges, his decision and the planning of the murder (Hdt. 1.11. 2–5), a report of the murder (Hdt. 1.12) and perhaps the Lydians' hostile reaction and the negotiation which led to the Delphic Oracle's confirmation of Gyges' legitimacy (Hdt. 1.13, predicted* ex machina *in the play?). None of this is verifiable, and the idea that the play began with Candaules persuading Gyges or explaining his scheme in retrospect in a prologue speech is rather unlikely. The Queen's speech is sufficient to establish the dramatic situation, and the focus should be on her reaction. Her explanation that Candaules has already left the palace suggests that the audience has not seen him in person.*

Opinions on the date of the play have differed widely. Lobel thought it was 'prima facie pre-Sophoclean' and thus available to Herodotus, and Page argued in detail that this was indeed a tragedy by a contemporary of Aeschylus and the source of Herodotus's narrative. Some have accepted this view,[3] *but it was promptly disputed by others who saw this as a Hellenistic play based on Herodotus.*[4] *This is now the more widely favoured opinion.*[5] *Some relevant criteria could point in either direction (an exotic subject and setting, strict metre, Aeschylean and other archaic or archaizing vocabulary). Some points of prosody and grammar seem*

---

[2] See especially Page 7–12; Lesky 1953, 6–9 (assuming a five-act structure); Snell 199f. Kakridis insisted on confining the action to a single day, with a prologue speech by Candaules explaining the situation after the event (cf. Latte 140; Snell 199) and the murder done in daytime in the agora. Holzberg 277f. criticizes the circularities in this and other proposed reconstructions.

[3] e.g. Raubitschek, Cataudella, Snell, Garzya.

[4] See especially Maas, Latte, Kamerbeek, Gigante, Cantarella, Lesky 1953. The arguments for both positions were reviewed sceptically by Holzberg.

[5] e.g. Marini 44, Xanthakis-Karamanos 395–97, Fantuzzi–Hunter 2004, 434, Kotlińska-Toma 182–85, Hornblower 104f.

to suggest a late date,[6] *but we have almost nothing from early tragedy other than Aeschylus to compare them with. The essential question is whether Herodotus is likely to have relied on a tragedy for his story, or* vice versa*. Page assumed that the tragic features in Herodotus (Candaules destined to fall, a defiant queen, Gyges' dilemma) must have been inspired by an actual tragedy, and suggested that the play might have been the first of an Aeschylean-style trilogy on the history of the Mermnad dynasty from its beginnings to its downfall under Croesus, which is the subject of the extended narrative in Herodotus 1.6–55 and 69–91.*[7] *But a 'tragic' interpretation of events pervades the whole of Herodotus's history and is not dependent on specific literary sources.*[8] *Once that is recognized it seems far more likely that this was a play based on his classic narrative than that this part of his history was inspired by an obscure play. A studiously derivative work of this kind probably dates from the Hellenistic period, in which the popularity of erotic tales involving historical oriental characters and situations is well documented.*[9]

---

[6] The definite article lengthened before plosive + liquid in ὁ̃ δράσας (22) is unparalleled in 5th/4th C. tragic dialogue, and the augment lengthened in προε̃δραμεν (15) is rare except in Euripides (but see Aesch. *Pers.* 395 ἐπε̃φλεγεν, *Supp.* 624 ἐπε̃κρανεν, *Ag.* 536 ἔ̃θρισεν, *PV* 447 ἔ̃βλεπον). ἐγρήσσοντα (an epicism) and ἀῦπνίας are less surprising, but the neglect of Attic correption in all four cases is notable. προέδραμεν without crasis (προὔδραμεν) is also unparalleled (Soph. *Ant.* 208 προέξουσ' is προ-ἔξουσ(ι) with aspiration). Loose descriptive genitives (19 φόνου λόχος 'a murder plot', 24 αἰσχύνης βοήν 'a cry of shame' and perhaps 30f. μῦθος . . . πειθοῦς '*persuasive* talk') are characteristic of Hellenistic and New Testament Greek (on the classical usage see KG 1.264(c), Mastronarde on Eur. *Pho.* 1491).

[7] Page 1951a, 27f, cf. Raubitschek 1955, 49, Snell 1973, 205, Garzya 1993, 549. Page (1962) and Snell (1973, 203–5) saw evidence of a relevant tragedy on Croesus in the fragments of an Attic vase from the second quarter of the fifth century published by Beazley (1955).

[8] On this point see especially Gigante 1952, 9, Holzberg 1973, 283–86, Lesky 1977, Griffin 2006.

[9] »» Whitmarsh 2010, 404–8. There is no chance of identifying the poet. Maas and Latte suggested a member of the Pleiad (which might help to account for the survival of the text to around 200 AD). Gigante's arguments for Lycophron of Chalcis relied on some uncompelling comparisons with the *Alexandra*. Suggestions for a fifth-century poet have included Phrynichus (Lobel, Page) and Ion of Chios (Kamerbeek, Raubitschek, Huxley 1965, 43–46)

Col. 1 (lower part): 5 lines all or almost all lost, then ends of twelve iambic trimeters:

]μα γῆς
]..ιρου σ̣τ̣εφ[
]ι̣ς ἐγχωρίοις
] προσκυνῶ
]θ̣εσθαι τάδε .
]. ἀμηχανῶ
].α καὶ πρὸ τοῦ
]ν̣ λέξω τὸ πᾶν
]..ε γίγνεται
] π̣ροέδραμεν
]ιδωμοι λόγου
] ξ̣υνήλικας

Col. 2 (lower part):

Γύ[γην γὰρ ὡ]ς ἐσ̣εῖδον, [ο]ὐκ εἴκασμά τι,
ἔδε̣[ισα] μὴ φό̣νο̣υ τις ἔνδον ᾗ λ̣ό̣χ̣[ο]ς̣,
ὁπ̣[οῖα] τὰπίχειρα ταῖς τυραννίσιν·
ἐ̣[πε]ὶ δ’ ἔτ’ ἐγρήσσοντα Κανδαύλην ὁρῶ,
τὸ δρασθὲν ἔγνων κα[ὶ] τίς ὁ δράσας ἀνήρ·
ὡς δ’ ἀξυνήμων, καρδί[ας] κυκωμένης,
καθεῖρξα σῖ[γα]. . . [. . .] αἰσχύ̣ν̣[ης] βοήν·
ἐν δεμνίω[ι δὲ φρον]τ̣ίσιν στρωφωμένῃ
νὺξ ἦν ἀτέρ[μων ἐξ] ἀυπνίᾳς ἐμ̣οί·
ἐπεὶ δ’ ἀνῆλ[θε παμ]φαὴς Ἑωσφόρος
τῆς πρωτοφεγ[γοῦς ἡ]μέρας πρ[ο]άγγελος,
τὸν μὲν λέχους ἤγε̣ι̣ρ̣[α] κἀξεπεμψάμην
λαοῖς θεμιστεύσοντα (μῦθος ἦν ἐμοί
πειθοῦς ἑτοῖμο[ς. . .]τ̣ο[.]οσ.[. . .]. . . . .(.)[
εὕδειν ἄνακτα παν[υχ),
Γύγην δ’ ἐμοὶ κλητῆρ.[

Col. 1. Ends of fifteen lines probably from a dialogue, including (6–17):

. . . . . the land's . . . . . *(by the customs?)* of our country . . . . . I make obeisance . . . . . *to settle* (*or to learn*) these things *(well?)*[10] . . . . . I am unable . . . . . and before this . . . . . I shall tell the whole tale . . . . . becomes/happens . . . . . ran ahead[15] . . . . . of/from speech(?) . . . . . *(my?)* companions . . .

Col. 2. Some lines lost, then part of a speech by the Queen:

When I discerned *Gyges* — not some apparition — *I feared* a murder plot might be within, for such are the rewards for tyrannies.[20] But *when* I saw Candaules still awake, I realised what had been done, and what man had done it. But I feigned unawareness and with quaking heart *silently* suppressed . . . a cry of shame. In bed I turned about with *anxious thoughts*;[25] my night was *endless*, sleepless as I was. But when the *all*-radiant Dawn-star made her ascent, harbinger of *day* with its first *light*, I roused my husband from bed and sent him out to administer law to the people (I had some[30] persuasive talk ready . . . . . a king to sleep all *night* . . . . . .), and *(sent a man to?) summon* Gyges to me . . .

Col. 3 (lower part): beginnings of fourteen trimeters (34–47) with paragraphi marking speaker-changes at 42, 46, 47, including:

θέλω δ̣ε̣φ̣[
ἐμαῖς ανῳ̣[45
— λέγοις ἂν ῳ̣[
— ̣υδωντι ̣[
two or three lines lost at foot of Col. 3

6 σ̣τ̣εφ̣[Pfeiffer γ̣λεφ̣[Lobel 8 νόμο]ις *(e.g.)* Lobel θεο]ῖς Marini 10 θέσθαι τάδ’ εὖ Lobel πεύ]θ̣εσθαι (*or* πεί]θ̣εσθαι) τάδε? Kannicht 15–16 ἐμοὶ δὲ θυμὸς φροντίδος] π̣ροέδραμεν | [τιμωρία τ’ ἀφεῖλεν α]ἰ̣δῶ μοι λόγου Snell (*e.g.*) 18 γὰρ ὡ]ς Mette 19 λ̣ό̣χ̣[ο]ς Fraenkel *ap.* Lobel 31 οὗ]τ̣ο[ς] Maas, Page 32 πάν[νυχον Lobel παν[νύχως βουληφόρον Maas πάν[νυχ’ ᾧ̣ λαῶν μέλει Page 33 or δέ μοι 47 Λυδῶν *or* αὐδῶν (*or* αὐδῶντι) Lobel

Notes on adesp. F 664

6–17. Probably from a dialogue between the Queen and the chorus-leader (above, p. 387). In lines 6–9 the chorus-leader perhaps makes an **obeisance** (**προσκυνῶ**) to the Queen and in line 10 asks to learn what troubles her (πεύ]θεσθαι Kannicht), or refers to settling her problem well (θέσθαι τάδ’ εὖ Lobel, thinking the trace following ταδε might represent a further letter). In line 11 the Queen perhaps confesses that she cannot decide whether to speak, and line 12 might be either the chorus-leader or the Queen appealing to the loyalty they have shown her **before now**. In line 13 the Queen agrees to **tell the whole tale** to the sympathetic chorus who are her **companions** (**ξυνήλικας**, 17; ξυνήλικες, lit. ‘age-mates’, refers to choruses (male) in Aesch. *Pers.* 784, Eupolis fr. 193.5 [= 192.185] *PCG*; similarly ἥλικες *Pers.* 681, Eur. *HF* 513). Snell’s supplements in lines 15–16 (see app. crit.) give ‘*But for me anger* has outrun *careful thought*, *and vengeance has removed my shame* at speaking’.

21–26. The tragedian adds emotive detail to the plain narrative of Herodotus 1.10.2 (above, p. 387). **καρδί[ας] κυκωμένης, with quaking heart:** editors compare Archilochus fr. 128.1 θυμέ, θύμ’, ἀμηχάνοισι κήδεσιν κυκώμενε, ‘Spirit, my spirit, roiled by intractable cares’.

27f. **when the *all*-radiant Dawn-star made her ascent etc.:** a poetic flourish (‘as soon as day came’, Herodotus) coming rather inappropriately from the anxious Queen. The word πρωτοφεγγής is found only here, προάγγελος not again before Plutarch (the verb προαγγέλλω in Thuc. 7.65, Xen. *Cyr.* 3.3.34,

Col. 3. Some lines lost, then beginnings of fourteen lines from a dialogue including (44–47):

Gyges? . . . . . I want/am willing . . . . . *(to/for?)* my . . .[45]

Queen? You may speak . . .

Gyges? . . . *of the Lydians?* . . .

etc.). Lobel compared Ion of Chios fr. 745 *PMG* ἀοῖον ἀεροφοίταν ἀστέρα . . . ἀελίου λευκᾶι πτέρυγι πρόδρομον, 'the air-roaming Dawn-star . . . Sun's forerunner on pale wing'.

29–33. I roused my husband etc.: the Queen explains how she is dealing with her husband (**τὸν μὲν . . .**) and with Gyges (**Γύγην δὲ . . .**). Lines 30a–32 (**μῦθος ἦν ἐμοί . . .**) are a parenthesis, so the subject in line 33 was probably still 'I'. Lobel identified the gist of her ***persuasive*** **talk** in Zeus's (disastrous) advice to Agamemenon *via* a dream in *Iliad* 2.24 (= 2.61): οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εὕδειν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα ᾧ λαοί τ' ἐπιτετράφαται καὶ τόσσα μέμηλε, 'a man who brings counsel should not sleep all night, one whom the people rely on and who has so many things to take care of'. Hence **a king** *who gives counsel* (Maas), **a king** *who cares for the people* (Page). **[*persuasive* talk:** this assumes that πειθοῦς is a descriptive genitive dependent on μῦθος, uncertainly as the second half of line 31 is missing: cf. Lobel 215 on col. ii.13ff.**]**

Hyginus, *Fab.* 100
Teuthras

Welcker 1839, 415f.; Pilling 1886, 62f.; Robert 1887, 246–48; Thraemer 1888, 374–79; Pearson 1917, II.70–72; Brizi 1928, 109–12; Rose 1933, 74f.

Hyginus, *Fab.* 100, *Teuthras*

Teuthrantem regem in Moesia Idas Apharei filius regno priuare uoluit; quo cum Telephus Herculis filius ex responso quaerens matrem cum comite Parthenopaeo uenisset, huic Teuthras regnum et filiam Augen in coniugium daturum promisit si se ab hoste tutasset. (2) Telephus condicionem regis non praetermisit, cum Parthenopaeo Idam uno proelio superauit; cui rex pollicitam fidem praestitit, regnumque et Augen matrem inscientem in coniugium dedit; quae cum mortalem neminem uellet suum corpus uiolare, Telephum interficere uoluit inscia filium suum. (3) itaque cum in thalamum uenissent, Auge ensem sumpsit ut Telephum interficeret. tum deorum uoluntate dicitur draco immani magnitudine inter eos exisse, quo uiso Auge ensem proiecit et Telepho inceptum patefecit. (4) Telephus re audita inscius matrem interficere uoluit; illa Herculem uiolatorem suum implorauit et ex eo Telephus matrem agnouit et in patriam suam reduxit.

Idas, son of Aphareus, wanted to deprive Teuthras, king in Mysia, of his kingdom. When Telephus, son of Hercules, arrived there directed by an oracle in search of his mother, with his comrade Parthenopaeus, Teuthras promised to give him the kingdom and his daughter Auge in marriage if he protected him from his enemy. (2) Telephus did not pass up the king's proposition, and with Parthenopaeus defeated Idas in a single battle. The king kept his promise and gave him the kingdom and Auge, his unknowing mother, in marriage. She, wanting no mortal to violate her body, determined to kill Telephus her own son, unknowingly. (3) So when they had entered the bridal chamber, Auge seized a sword so as to kill Telephus. Then by the gods' will a serpent of enormous size is said to have emerged between them, and on seeing this Auge threw down the sword and revealed to Telephus her intention. (4) On hearing this Telephus determined unknowingly to kill his mother. She prayed to Hercules, her violator, and from that Telephus recognized his mother and took her back to her own country.

Hyginus, Fab. *100 is not included among the Adespota in* TrGF *Vol. 2, presumably because some scholars have identified its source as Sophocles'* Mysians *(see* TrGF *4.349 and further below). It is named after Teuthras, eponym of the city and territory of Teuthrania in the lower Caicus valley, and presents an episode in the mythical history of Telephus sandwiched between the stories of his birth (*Fab*. 99, 'Auge') and his wounding and healing by Achilles (*Fab*. 101, 'Telephus'). In the best-known versions of his myth Telephus was separated at birth from his mother Auge, who had been raped by Heracles and was either dispatched to be drowned or driven from Arcadia by her father when he discovered her pregnancy. Telephus survived exposure on Mount Parthenion and grew up in Arcadia, while Auge also survived and one way or another reached Mysia where the local ruler Teuthras made her his wife.*[1] *On reaching manhood Telephus went in search of his mother, found her in Mysia and stayed there as Teuthras's adopted son and military leader. His arrival in Mysia and reunion with his mother were dramatized by Sophocles and probably by Aeschylus in plays named* Mysians*. Plays with this name ascribed to Agathon (**F 3a**) and Nicomachus of Alexandria Troas (**T 1**) were probably on the same subject (see below, p. 398).*

The story summarized by Hyginus is a supercharged account of the reunion of mother and son, with the basic mythical motifs (separated kin, lost identities, a hero guided by an oracle, recognition and reunion) complicated by sensational additions. Auge is now Teuthras's adopted daughter and is promised to Telephus in return for his aid (a folktale pattern with variants in tragedy). The promise leads Telephus to the brink of an Oedipal union with his mother, then to her attempt to kill him foiled by divine intervention, and finally to his attempt to kill her leading to their recognition. The near-killing of an unrecognized son by his mother recalls Euripides' Cresphontes*, and those of both son by mother and mother by son recall Euripides'* Ion*, where Creusa's attempt to poison Ion is miraculously foiled when Apollo's dove drinks the poison and Ion's retaliation ends with the Pythia's intervention and proof of his*

[1] Sources and variants are well summarized by Gantz 1993, 428–31; also Scheer 1993, 71–95, Collard–Cropp–Lee 2009, 22, 42f., Fowler 2013, 309–11.

real origin. Those and other features of the narrative point to a tragic plot, and this is consistent with Aelian's mention of Telephus's near-incest and its prevention by the serpent as a tragic subject.[2]

A rough outline of the play can be constructed from Hyginus's summary. A prologue will have included a speech outlining Teuthras's situation and a dialogue in which Telephus and Parthenopaeus, recently arrived in Mysia, discuss their mission (like Orestes and Pylades in Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*). They meet with Teuthras, and Telephus agrees to help him in return for his daughter's hand (like the treacherous Cisseus in Euripides'* Archelaus*). The heroes depart for battle, and soon a messenger reports their victory. Telephus returns to claim his bride, who probably in the meantime has declared her resistance to the marriage and her intention to kill him if he returns. The wedding takes place, Auge's attack on Telephus and the serpent's intervention occur within the palace (probably with commentary from the chorus), and Telephus pursues her, sword in hand, into the open where she takes refuge on the altar in the orchestra. After some altercation she prays to Heracles for his protection, further dialogue reveals the facts of her son's birth, and Telephus finally realizes that he has found his mother as the oracle predicted. Heracles perhaps appears* ex machina *to confirm this and direct Auge's return to Arcadia. It also seems likely that Telephus and Auge met and conversed, unknown to each other, at some early point in the play, like Ion and Creusa in* Ion *and Orestes and Iphigenia in* Iphigenia in Tauris*. There may well have been a chorus, though this would naturally have been unmentioned by Hyginus. If so, it probably consisted of women in whom Auge could confide.*

Hyginus's story differs from the predominant versions of the myth in several ways. Telephus is guided to Mysia by an oracle rather than seeking purification for the killing of his uncles, the sons of Aleus. Auge is Teuthras's adopted daughter rather than his wife, and Telephus's discovery of his mother thus becomes the chance result of his winning

[2] Aelian, *Nature of Animals* 3.47: 'Allow me to ask the tragedians why on earth they pour such ignorance upon Laius's son and upon Telephus . . . who did not attempt the union but did lie down with his mother and would have accomplished the same things [*sc.* as Oedipus] if the divinely sent serpent had not kept them apart'.

the king's daughter.[3] *Idas and his threat to Teuthras's kingdom are probably* ad hoc *inventions.*[4] *Parthenopaeus is best known as one of the Seven killed at Thebes and accompanies Telephus to Mysia only here.*[5] *Auge's return to Arcadia is also unique and is possible only when she is Teuthras's adopted daughter rather than his wife.*[6]

---

[3] [Hesiod] fr. 165 M–W = 117 Most already makes Auge Teuthras's adopted daughter but sets the adoption before her encounter with Heracles and Telephus's birth. This has been considered a later interpolation or at least as not proving that Telephus was credited with Arcadian ancestry in the archaic period (»» Scheer 1993, 82–84), but a new fragment of Archilochus relating Telephus's routing of the Achaeans in the Caicus plain (P. Oxy. 4708 = fr. 17A Swift) agrees with it in calling Telephus 'Arcasides', i.e. (probably) a descendant of Arcas: cf. Swift 2014, 439f. with n. 18; 2019, 229–31, 235.

[4] Idas son of Aphareus is otherwise one of the Apharetidae who with his brother Lynceus fought against Castor and Pollux for the hands of their cousins, the daughters of Leucippus (cf. Vol. 1, p. 208 on *Rhadamanthys*). The *Iliad*'s Aphareus is an Achaean killed by Aeneas. Hyginus's Idas could be an error for Idaios (i.e. from Mt. Ida), a stock name shared by three characters in the *Iliad* (Thraemer 376); and 'son of Apahareus' could be due to a mythographer's confusion with the father of Idas and Lynceus.

[5] There is an obvious connection with the preceding fable of Hyginus (*Fab.* 99, 'Auge') which relates that he and Telephus were both exposed by their mothers on Mount Parthenion and raised together by herdsmen. The origin of this is unknown but it may have been another innovation prompted by the Attalids' interest in promoting their mythical relationship with Arcadia and was probably explained in the initial dialogue between the two comrades. They also appeared together in the Latin *Atalanta* of Pacuvius which was probably based on a Greek original modelled on the Telephus–Auge reunion plot (»» Schierl 2006, 162–91). Parthenopaeus, exposed at birth by his mother Atalanta, searches for her in Arcadia with Telephus's help and unknowingly competes for her hand in the traditional footrace. He either loses and is duly condemned to be killed by her or wins so that she, like Auge, must kill him in order to preserve her supposed virginity. Either way, recognition will have averted the disaster.

[6] In *Anth.Pal.* 3.2 (one of the epigrams on the reliefs decorating the temple of Apollonis, mother of the Pergamene rulers Eumenes II and Attalus II, in her home city of Cyzicus: *LIMC* 'Auge' no. 29, 'Telephus' no. 43) Telephus says that he came to Mysia to find his mother and take her back to Arcadia, but the subject of the relief was 'Telephus recognized by his mother' and the suggestion of a return to Arcadia was probably the epigrammatist's inference (Scheer 1993, 143 n. 433). Auge was supposed to have been buried at Pergamum, at least in the second century AD (Pausanias 8.4.9).

While isolated in literature,[7] *this version of the story was incorporated in the mythology of the Hellenistic kingdom of Pergamum and is featured in the Telephus Frieze which decorated a stoa in the monumental Altar of Zeus constructed for the ruler Eumenes II in the 160s BC.*[8] *The frieze (now partially reconstructed in the Pergamon Museum in Berlin) depicted the life of the dynasty's adopted mythical ancestor in seventy-four low-relief panels, including Telephus receiving weapons from Auge and leaving for battle (nos 16–18), Auge given to Telephus in marriage (no. 20), and the serpent separating them in the bridal chamber (no. 21). Thus the reunion story as it appears in Hyginus, or something close to it, became part of an official biography of their ancestor which was developed by the dynasts of Pergamum and proclaimed in the frieze.*[9] *Its origin remains unclear. Robert argued that Hyginus's summary must reflect a classic fifth-century tragedy and that Sophocles'* Mysians *was the only likely candidate,*[10] *but a melodramatic plot of this kind is more likely to have been composed in the third or early second century by someone connected with the Attalid court and imitating Euripidean models. Obviously a poet cannot be identified, but the Hellenistic tragedian Nicomachus who came from Alexandria in the Troad, a city closely tied to the Attalids, is a plausible candidate, especially if he is correctly credited with a* Mysians *(pp. 306f. above with* ***T 1****).*

---

[7] The Latin *Teuthras* of C. Julius Caesar Strabo (who died in a political conflict in 87 BC) is known only from a single verse quoted by Macrobius (Ribbeck 1897, 263). It could have been a version of the play summarized by Hyginus.

[8] The frieze as now reconstructed is described in detail with drawings in *LIMC* VII.1.857–62 (M. Strauss, H. Heres), cf. Heres 1996. Detailed studies of many aspects in Dreyfus–Schraudolph 1996–97 (drawings, I.16f.).

[9] Cf. the Telephus relief in Cyzicus (n. 6 above). On the importance of Telephus and his father Heracles in Attalid ideology, politics and cult see especially Kertész 1982, Scheer 1993, 127–52 and 2003, 220–236, Kosmetatou 2003b, 166–73; also Williamson 2016 on Teuthras and Teuthrania. The frieze as a whole might have been modelled on an epic poem (so e.g. Kertész 211, Scheer 133 with n. 373, Stewart 1996, 43), although there is no direct trace of this.

[10] Robert 1887, 246–48 (1921, 1146f.), followed by Pearson and many others (recently Sommerstein 2012, 205–7). Welcker had suggested this before the frieze was known (1839, 415f.). Pilling, Thraemer, Brizi, Rose all rejected the identification.

Hyginus, *Fab.* 120–121 (*TrGF* Adesp. F 10c)
Chryses

TrGF II.23. Robert 1921, 1335–37; Grilli 1975. Pacuvius, *Chryses*: Schierl 2006, 192–239.

Hyginus, *Fab.* 120 (*Iphigenia Taurica*) §5 and *Fab.* 121 (*Chryses*)

(120.5) *rex sacerdoti dicto audiens fuit. occasione Iphigenia nacta, signo sublato cum fratre Oreste et Pylade in navem ascendit ventoque secundo ad insulam Zminthen ad Chrysem sacerdotem Apollinis delati sunt.*

(121) *Agamemnon cum ad Troiam iret, et Achilles in Moesiam uenit et Chryseidam Apollinis sacerdotis filiam adduxit eamque Agamemnoni dedit in coniugium; quod cum Chryses ad Agamemnonem deprecandum uenisset ut sibi filiam suam redderet, non impetrauit. (2) ob id Apollo exercitum eius partim fame ⟨partim peste⟩ prope totum consumpsit, itaque Agamemnon Chryseida grauidam sacerdoti remisit, quae cum diceret se ab eo intactam esse, suo tempore peperit Chrysen iuniorem et dixit se ab Apolline concepisse. (3) postea, Chryses Thoanti eos cum reddere uellet, Chryseis audiit Agamemnonis Iphigeniam et Orestem filios esse; quae Chrysi filio suo quid ueri esset patefecit, eos fratres esse et Chrysen Agamemnonis filium esse. tum Chryses re cognita cum Oreste fratre Thoantem interfecit et inde Mycenas cum signo Dianae incolumes peruenerunt.*

121, §2 *⟨partim peste⟩* Micyllus §3 *Chryseis audiit . . . quae Chrysi* Grilli (*Chryseis ut audiit . . . Chrysi* M. Schmidt) *Chryses audiit senior . . . qui Chrysi* F

(120.5) . . . The king heeded what the priestess had said. Iphigenia took the opportunity and taking up the image boarded the ship with Orestes and Pylades; and a fair wind carried them to the island of Sminthe, to Chryses priest of Apollo.

(121) When Agamemnon was on his way to Troy, Achilles too came to Mysia and took Chryseis, daughter of the priest of Apollo, and gave her to Agamemnon as a concubine; and when Chryses came to Agamemnon to beg him to return his daughter to him, he did not get his wish. (2) Apollo therefore wiped out nearly the whole of Agamemnon's army, partly by hunger, ⟨*partly by disease*⟩;[1] and so

[1] The *Iliad* speaks only of disease (λοιμός, 1.43ff.). Rose suggested that the Greek text of this summary originally read τοὺς μὲν λιμῷ, τοὺς δὲ λοιμῷ ('some

Agamemnon returned Chryseis, now pregnant, to the priest. She said she was untouched by Agamemnon, and in her due time gave birth to a younger Chryses and said that the father was Apollo. (3) Later, when Chryses was prepared to hand them back to Thoas, Chryseis heard that Iphigenia and Orestes were Agamemnon's children, and she revealed to her son Chryses the truth,[2] that they were his siblings and that Chryses was Agamemnon's son. Then Chryses, having learned the facts, joined with Orestes in killing Thoas; and from there they (i.e. the fugitives) reached Mycenae unharmed with the image of Diana.

Hyginus, Fab. *120 is a summary of Euripides'* Iphigenia in Tauris *except that it omits that play's ending in which the goddess Athena forbids Thoas's pursuit and confirms the couple's safe return to Attica. Instead, its final sentence says that the couple sailed 'to the island of Sminthe, to Chryses priest of Apollo', which is probably a confused reference to the Smintheion at Chrysa, a sanctuary of the 'mouse-god' Apollo Smintheus on the mainland some 50km. south of Troy, where Chryses was priest.*[3] Fab. *121 continues the story but first explains that when she was returned to her father (as in* Iliad *1) Chryseis was secretly pregnant with a son by Agamemnon whom she bore and named Chryses, claiming that Apollo was the father. The summary then relates that this younger Chryses was willing to surrender Orestes and Iphigenia to Thoas, but that his mother heard that they were Agamemnon's children and revealed to him that he was their half-brother; he then relented and assisted Orestes in killing Thoas before sending the fugitives safely on*

---

by hunger, some by disease'), and that the second phrase was already omitted in the copy which Hyginus used.

[2] The text of Hyginus has 'the elder Chryses heard . . . and he revealed to his son Chryses the truth', but the younger Chryses was his grandson. Probably *Chryseis* was miscopied as *Chryses* and *senior* then added for clarification. There is no real indication that the elder Chryses appeared in this play at all. The scene on the British Museum cup (below, pp. 401f.) does not include him and shows Chryseis warning her son.

[3] Strabo 13.1.47f. This was usually supposed to have been the home of Homer's Chryses and his daughter Chryseis, although Strabo 13.1.62f. insists on another Chrysa and Smintheion 70 km. to the east. The Smintheion site (near modern Gülpinar) has been extensively excavated since 1980. Ribbeck (1875, 250) and Robert (1921, 1335) thought Hyginus's 'island' might be Tenedos (just off the west coast of the Troad), which also had a Smintheion, but the poet would hardly have removed Chryseis and her son from their traditional home.

their way home. The reference to 'them' in Fab. *121.3 makes it clear that this is a continuation from the end of* Fab. *120, but the summary omits (at least) the fact that in this version of the story Thoas had pursued the fugitives and arrived at Chrysa demanding their surrender. Grilli suggests that the explanations in* Fab. *121.1–2 originated in a marginal note which was incorporated into the Greek text used by Hyginus, but they might well have been prologue material summarized in a tragic hypothesis. In any case, we very probably have the bare bones of a tragic plot invented as an exciting sequel to Euripides'* Iphigenia in Tauris.

Some flesh can be added to these bones from a scene depicted on a fine silver cup dated to the late first century BC and now in the British Museum.[4] *It shows three groups of figures. On the left, Orestes and Iphigenia (veiled and holding the Taurian image of Artemis) sit beneath a plane tree in a sanctuary of Apollo, and Pylades stands in front of them grasping the tree for protection but looking defiantly towards the two figures on the far right; these are Thoas and an armed attendant, marked out by their barbarian clothing. Between these two groups the young Chryses faces Thoas and negotiates with him while his mother anxiously grasps at his shoulder and points towards the suppliants. The scene thus captures the crucial moment of the play when Chryses is about to surrender the fugitives but is restrained by Chryseis, and it adds the important point that the fugitives are suppliants in the sanctuary of Apollo. The scene on the cup was presumably not an original composition and may well have been based on a Hellenistic wall-painting from around 200 BC.*[5] *Haynes noted that the little statue of Apollo depicted on the cup resembles the Apollo Smintheus depicted on coins of the nearby Hellenistic city of Alexandria Troas, and that the cup might have been made in this region, for example in Pergamum.*

Hyginus's story has often been associated with Sophocles' Chryses*, which is the only recorded Greek drama with this title but is known only*

[4] BM reg. 1960 2-I I, *LIMC* III, 'Chryses II' no. 1 (K. Schefold); Corbett–Strong 1961, 68–77, Haynes 1961, Webster 1967, 166, Hall 2013, 146f. The scene was also reproduced on Arretine pottery (*terra sigillata*) of the early first century AD (*LIMC* nos 2a–d: »» Stenico 1966).

[5] Schefold in *LIMC*.

from five brief and undistinctive fragments.[6] *The connection was denied by Wilamowitz,*[7] *partly on the grounds that Sophocles' play was produced before Euripides'* Iphigenia in Tauris *whereas Hyginus's story obviously depends on Euripides. The relative datings are debatable,*[8] *but even if Sophocles'* Chryses *was the later production it was not necessarily the source of Hyginus's story, which hardly resembles a late Sophoclean plot and looks more like a later 'sub-Euripidean' invention.*

Also relevant is the Latin Chryses *of Pacuvius, produced probably in the 140s or 130s BC and preserved in at least twenty-five text-fragments.*[9] *Most are brief lexical quotations from grammarians with no indications of speakers or contexts, and five are quoted by Cicero in various philosophical works. Cicero recalls a famous scene from Pacuvius's play in which Orestes defied Pylades' attempt to save him from death by assuming his identity,*[10] *and another scene in which an unnamed philosopher (*ille Pacuvianus physicus*) spoke about the natural processes of the universe and the unreliability of portents.*[11] *If Pacuvius's play was at least broadly similar to the* Chryses *summarized by*

---

[6] So e.g. Welcker 1839a, 210–15, Ribbeck 1875, 249f., Robert 1876, 134 n. 3 (but positing a fourth-century intermediary: 1921, 1336), Pearson 1917, III.327f., Schefold in *LIMC*, Burnett 1971, 75. Radt in *TrGF* and Lloyd-Jones in the Loeb *Sophocles Fragments* allow the possibility.

[7] Wilamowitz 1883, 253f.; cf. Schierl 199f.

[8] »» Burnett 1971, 75 n. 26, Marshall 2009. A scholion on Ar. *Birds* 1240 (of 414 BC) says that Aristophanes' phrase Διὸς μακέλλῃ πᾶν ἀναστρέψει Δίκη was modelled on Sophocles' μακέλλῃ Ζηνὸς ἐξαναστραφῇ (*Chryses* F 727), but that was no doubt just a guess.

[9] »» Schierl 2006, 192–239 with frs 62–86 and noting two more possibilities, her frs 262 and 295. Further speculative attributions have been proposed.

[10] *De Finibus* 2.79 (T 51 Schierl) and 5.63 (fr. 69), *De Amicitia* 24 (T 52). These are now generally assigned to the *Chryses* rather than the *Dulorestes*, although Cicero does not name the play. Fr. 70 ('I think I've found which of them is Orestes') is clearly attributed to *Chryses* by Nonius. The scene was obviously modelled on the scene in *Iphigenia in Tauris* in which Pylades volunteers to die with Orestes and Orestes insists that he should live (*Iph.Taur.* 679ff.). It is perhaps recalled in Ovid, *Tristia* 1.9.27f. (Schierl 198f.).

[11] *De Divinatione* 1.131 = Pacuvius frs 77 and 80 Schierl; frs 78, 79 and 81 seem to come from the same speech. Ribbeck (1875, 256–58) thought the speech was essentially a paraphrase of the hymn to Earth and Aether in Euripides' *Chrysippus* (F 839) and questioned its attribution to Pacuvius's *Chryses*. His view of the relationship with F 839 is sceptically assessed by Schierl 203–210.

Hyginus and depicted on the British Museum cup (as is generally assumed), some of the fragments can plausibly be related to a sequence in which the fugitives land in Chryses' territory and seek protection (frs 62–68 Schierl) and Chryses hesitates and takes counsel (frs 74, 76 and probably the philosophical frs 77–81). The fugitives will have claimed Apollo's protection as suppliants as in the cup scene, and this may have prompted a debate over Orestes' guilt as a matricide (with Orestes perhaps portrayed as still afflicted by the Furies as in Iphigenia in Tauris*).*[12] *Thoas will then have arrived*[13] *demanding their surrender and persuaded Chryses to give up Orestes, with Orestes rejecting Pylades' attempt to take his place. The rest will then have followed as in Hyginus. Much of this is conjectural, however, and relying on Pacuvius for the content of the earlier play is risky as Pacuvius may have introduced his own innovations. Fantham (2001, 2003, following Altheim 1935, 283–98 on* Atalanta*) credits Pacuvius with inventing several of the plots reflected in summaries of Hyginus (*Atalanta, Medus, Iliona, Chryses*), but it seems unlikely that Pacuvius would have invented whole new slices of Greek myth, and the grounds for denying the existence of Hellenistic models are not very strong. (Schierl leaves the issue open, pp. 28f. with 166f., 197, 318, 351 on the individual plays). The scene on the British Museum cup seems to point to a Hellenistic model for the Chryses.*

[12] Schierl 200f. with T 8: Servius on *Aeneid* 4.473 says that in an unnamed play of Pacuvius Orestes took refuge from the Furies in a temple of Apollo and was assailed by them when he tried to leave it (i.e. a mad scene). Fr. 75, 'May the gods put you in mind of better things and avert your madness', could have been said by Chryses to Orestes near the end of the play.

[13] Thoas is named only in a fragment conjecturally attributed to Pacuvius, fr. 71 Schierl ('Bring weapons quickly, servants; Thoas is pursuing me!').

Hyginus, *Fab.* 122 (*TrGF* Adesp. F *3e)
Aletes

TrGF II.9f. Welcker 1839a, 215–19, cf. 1841, 1198; Ribbeck 1875, 469–74; Wilamowitz 1929, 465f.

Hyginus, *Fab.* 122, *Aletes*

Ad Electram, Agamemnonis et Clytaemnestrae filiam, sororem Orestis, nuntius falsus uenit fratrem cum Pylade in Tauricis Dianae esse immolatos. id Aletes Aegisthi filius cum rescisset, ex Atridarum genere neminem superesse, regnum Mycenis obtinere coepit. (2) at Electra de fratris nece Delphos sciscitatum est profecta; quo cum uenisset, eodem die Iphigenia cum Oreste uenit eo. idem nuntius qui de Oreste dixerat, dixit Iphigeniam fratris interfectricem esse. (3) Electra ubi audiuit id, truncum ardentem ex ara sustulit uoluitque inscia sorori Iphigeniae oculos eruere, nisi Orestes interuenisset. cognitione itaque facta, Mycenas uenerunt et Aleten Aegisthi filium Orestes interfecit et Erigonam ex Clytaemnestra et Aegistho natam uoluit interficere, sed Diana eam rapuit et in terram Atticam sacerdotem fecit. (4) Orestes autem Neoptolemo interfecto Hermionen Menelai et Helenae filiam adductam coniugem duxit; Pylades autem Electram Agamemnonis et Clytaemnestrae filiam duxit.

Electra, daughter of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra, sister of Orestes, received false news that her brother and Pylades had been sacrificed to Diana in the land of the Taurians. When Aegisthus's son Aletes learned that none of the family of the Atridae was still alive, he set about taking possession of the kingdom at Mycenae. (2) But Electra set off for Delphi to enquire about her brother's death; and when she arrived there, Iphigenia arrived with Orestes on the same day. The same messenger who had spoken about Orestes said that Iphigenia was her (i.e. Electra's) brother's killer. (3) When Electra heard this, she lifted a burning brand from the altar and was about to thrust out her sister Iphigenia's eyes unknowingly, had not Orestes intervened. With recognition thus effected, they came to Mycenae and Orestes killed Aegisthus's son Aletes; he also wanted to kill Erigone, daughter of Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus, but Diana snatched her away and made her a priestess in the land of Attica. (4) Orestes, after killing Neoptolemus, took Hermione, daughter of Menelaus and Helen, and married her, while Pylades married Electra, daughter of Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra.

The story in Hyginus, Fab. 122 is otherwise unknown except for the routine conclusion in §4. It obviously presupposes Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris and in Hyginus's collection naturally follows Fab. 119, Orestes (the matricide and trial), Fab. 120, Iphigenia Taurica and Fab. 121, Chryses (above, pp. 399–403). The events at Delphi are just as obviously a contrived tragic scenario as Electra attacks her unrecognized sister believing her to be her brother's killer and Orestes intervenes just in time to avert the disaster and bring about the reunion. As for the children of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra, a son named Aletes is unknown elsewhere while a daughter Erigone is known and sometimes connected with Orestes, but not in this way. According to the epic poet Cinaethon (6th C.?) she became the mother of Orestes' son Penthilus, ancestor of the Penthilidae of Lesbos,[1] *while in another tradition she prosecuted Orestes before the Areopagus for the murder of her parents and hanged herself when he was acquitted.*[2] *Her near-killing by Orestes and rescue by Artemis to become her priestess in Attica seem to be modelled on Artemis's rescue of Iphigenia at Aulis and her transportation to the land of the Tauri.*

Welcker, who first pointed out the tragic character of Hyginus's story, thought that the summary reflected two tragedies, one set at Delphi culminating in the reunion of Agamemnon's children and one at Mycenae with the killing of Aletes and rescue of Erigone. Ribbeck preferred to create a single play by arbitrarily transferring the later action from Mycenae to Delphi. We might more plausibly suppose that the killing of Aletes was reported in a messenger-speech (like the killings of Aegisthus in Euripides' Electra *or Neoptolemus in* Andromache*), but that would hardly have included the near-killing and rescue of Erigone as well. Since the actions at Delphi and Mycenae are unique and interdependent (Orestes' supposed death prompts both Aletes' usurpation*

[1] Cinaethon fr. 4 *GEF* from Pausanias 2.18.6: »» Fowler 2013, 600f.

[2] This episode provided one of the *aitia* for the Aiora or 'Swinging' ritual associated with the Attic Anthesteria: *Etym.Magn.* 'Αιώρα', cf. Hesychius α 2217 (her prosecuting Orestes is mentioned by Apollodorus, *epit.* 6.25, the prosecution and suicide by hanging by Dictys Cret. 6.4). The Aiora is more commonly explained in ancient sources (following Eratosthenes' *Erigone*) as due to the suicide of Erigone daughter of Icarius, who hanged herself when her father was killed by country people thinking he was poisoning them with Dionysus's gift of wine. »» Burkert 1983, 223, 241–43; 1985, 241.

and Electra's journey to Delphi, and Orestes might well have exploited it for his attack on the usurper as he does against Aegisthus and Clytemnestra), we could be looking at a single invention divided between two plays.

The origins of this material are equally obscure. Nineteenth-century scholars looked for connections with known lost tragedies: Sophocles' Erigone *(three lines extant), Accius's Latin* Erigona *(seven fragments with eight lines), the Greek original of Accius's* Agamemnonidae *(*Children of Agamemnon*: two fragments with five lines) and the* Aleites *(interpreted as* Aletes*) attributed to Sophocles by Stobaeus.*[3] *None of these suggestions is particularly cogent;*[4] *Hyginus's story probably reflects an otherwise lost postclassical play or plays.*

[3] Welcker considered *Agamemnonidae* for his play set at Delphi and Sophocles' *Erigone* with Accius's *Erigona* for the sequel, adding the 'Sophoclean' *Aletes* as identical with the *Erigone*. Ribbeck connected the *Aletes* with Accius's *Agamemnonidae*, which he thought might be identical with his *Erigona*.

[4] On the *Aleites* fragments (*TrGF* adesp. F 1b) see above, p. 55 under Sophocles II. Accius's *Erigona* is now thought to have been about her prosecution of Orestes and perhaps derived from Sophocles: see e.g. Dangel 2002, 326 (also rejecting the equation of Accius's *Erigona* and *Agamemnonidae*). Other possibly relevant titles: Lycophron's *Aletes* (above, p. 289) and the *Erigone*s of Philocles I (**T 1** in Vol. 1, p. 126), Cleophon or Iophon (see Vol. 1, p. 124 on Iophon **T 1(a)**) and Phrynichus II (*TrGF* no. 212). Quintus Cicero's *Erigona* (Cicero, *Letters to Quintus* 3.6) was perhaps a version of Sophocles' play.

Hyginus, *Fab.* 190
Theonoe

Slater–Cropp 2009. *Mosaic.* Görkay *et al.* 2006; Önal 2008; Dunbabin 2010 (all with b/w photos; colour photos can be found on the internet).

Hyginus, *Fab.* 190, *Theonoe*

Thestor mantis habuit Calchantem filium et Leucippen filiam et Theonoen, quam ludentem a mari piratae rapuerunt et detulerunt in Cariam; quam rex Icarus sibi in concubinatum emit. (2) Thestor autem filia amissa inquisitum profectus est, qui naufragio in terram Cariam uenit, et in uincula est coniectus ibi ubi et Theonoe morabatur. (3) Leucippe autem patre et sorore amissis, Delphos petit an eorum foret inuestigatio. tum Apollo respondit, Pro meo sacerdote per terras uade, et eos reperies*. (4) Leucippe sorte audita capillos totondit, atque pro iuuene sacerdote circum terras exit inuestigatum. quae cum in Cariam deuenisset et Theonoe eam uidisset, aestimans sacerdotem esse, in amorem eius incidit, iubetque ad se perduci ut cum eo concumberet. (5) illa autem quia femina erat, negat id posse fieri; Theonoe irata iubet sacerdotem includi in cubiculum atque aliquem ex ergastulo uenire qui sacerdotem interficeret. (6) quem ad interficiendum mittitur senex Thestor imprudens ad filiam suam; quem Theonoe non agnouit, datque ei gladium et iubet eum sacerdotem interficere. qui cum intrasset et gladium teneret, Thestorem se uocitari dixit; duabus filiis Leucippe et Theonoe amissis ad hoc exitium uenisse, ut sibi scelus imperaretur. (7) quod ille in se cum conuertisset et uellet ipsum se interficere, Leucippe audito patris nomine gladium ei extorsit; quae ad reginam interficiendam ut ueniret, patrem Thestorem in adiutorio uocauit; Theonoe patris nomine audito indicat se filiam esse eius. Icarus autem rex agnitione facta cum muneribus eum in patriam remisit.*

The seer Thestor had a son Calchas and daughters Leucippe and Theonoe. Pirates from the sea stole Theonoe as she played and brought her to Caria, where king Icarus bought her to make her a concubine. (2) Thestor however, having lost his daughter, set off in search of her and arrived in Caria because of a shipwreck, and was thrown into chains in the place where Theonoe also was dwelling. (3) Leucippe in turn, having lost her father and her sister, asked Delphi if there should be a search for them. Apollo then replied, *Travel through the lands as my priest, and you will find them.* (4) On hearing the oracle Leucippe cut her

hair, and in the guise of a young priest set out to make her search around the lands. When she landed in Caria and Theonoe saw her, she (Theonoe) supposed that she (Leucipps) was a priest and fell in love with him, and gave orders for him to be brought to her so that she could sleep with him. (5) She, however, being a woman, said this could not happen. Theonoe, enraged, gave orders for the priest to be shut up in a chamber and for someone to come from the jail to kill the priest. (6) The man sent to kill him was the old man Thestor, who came all unaware to his own daughter. Theonoe did not recognize him, and gave him a sword and ordered him to kill the priest. When he had entered the chamber and was holding the sword, he said that he was called Thestor and after losing his two daughters Leucippe and Theonoe had come to this calamity of having a crime imposed on him. (7) He then turned it upon himself and was ready to kill himself, but Leucippe on hearing her father's name wrenched the sword away from him. She then called on her father Thestor to come and help her in killing the queen. Theonoe on hearing her father's name declared that she was his daughter. King Icarus for his part, now that the truth was recognized, sent him back with gifts to his native land.

The story told in Fab. *190 can be recognized as a tragic plot comparable with those discussed in the previous three sections, with father and daughters separated and now unknown to each other, two near-killings and one near-suicide, just-in-time recognitions and a happy ending, all guided by Apollo. The summary resembles a tragic hypothesis, beginning with* prolegomena *corresponding to the play's prologue scene(s) (§§1–4) and continuing with a series of scenes set before the king's palace (»» Slater–Cropp 78–82):*

> — Theonoe and the disguised Leucippe converse without recognizing each other; Leucippe rejects Theonoe's advances without revealing that she is a woman; Theonoe sends her into the palace to be confined in a chamber and summons a prisoner to exact her revenge;
>
> — the prisoner (Thestor) arrives, unrecognized by Theonoe; they converse and Theonoe sends him into the palace to kill Leucippe;
>
> — Thestor confronts Leucippe but turns the sword on himself and in a despairing speech names himself and his daughters, thus bringing about the first recognition. (The confrontation must have begun inside the palace, i.e. off-stage, but the two presumably emerged at some point so that the crisis and recognition took place on stage as for example in Euripides' *Cresphontes* and *Alexander*).

— Leucippe and Thestor plot revenge on Theonoe, probably planning for Leucippe to lure her into the palace where Thestor, armed with Theonoe's sword, will be ready to kill her;

— Theonoe is duly lured, but as she enters the palace Leucippe calls Thestor into action by name and thus brings about the second recognition and a joyful reunion scene;

— the play ends with the friendly king Icarus releasing Thestor and sending him back to his homeland, probably accompanied by Leucippe while Theonoe stays with Icarus as his queen (*reginam*, Hyginus §7).

This is of course an approximate and incomplete reconstruction with no indications of minor characters or incidental scenes, nor of the play's chorus if there was one (women sympathetic to Theonoe would be likely as in Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris *and* Helen*). Hyginus's sketch, like regular tragic hypotheses, summarizes the story rather than the dramatic action.*

Until recently this was the only evidence for the story of Theonoe and Leucippe. The so-called Theonoe mosaic, discovered in 2002 at the ancient site of Zeugma before it was submerged by the damming of the Euphrates river, now confirms that it was known at the borders of the eastern Roman Empire in the third century AD. The mosaic shows Theonoe (ΘΕΟΝΟΗ) watching a priest of Apollo as he places a small offering, probably incense, on an altar. The priest's head and caption are now missing, but a panel at the top right had the title Leucippe Shorn *([ΛΕΥΚΙΠΠ]Η ΚΕ[ΚΑ]ΡΜΕΝΗ), so the figure must be Leucippe disguised and with shorn head. Behind Theonoe stand a nurse (ΤΡΟΦΟΣ) accompanying Theonoe and two women wearing vine-wreaths and identified as Bacchants (ΒΑΧΧΑΙ). Theonoe wears the mask and costume of a pantomime, a virtuoso performer who 'danced' a narrative to music with rhythmic movements and gestures but without words. This was one of the most popular forms of entertainment in the period of the Roman empire in both theatres and private settings, often re-enacting stories from tragedy.*

The other figures in the mosaic are unmasked and not distinctively costumed, so it does not depict an actual performance. Rather, it evokes a performance by placing the masked figure in a 'real-life' setting and picturing the moment when Theonoe first sees Leucippe and instantly falls in love with her. Such a moment was ideally suited to the pantomime's repertoire of erotic and sexually ambivalent roles, and apparently to the tastes of diners in the triclinium *at Zeugma where it was paired*

with the well-known scene of the young Achilles disguised as a girl amongst the daughters of Lycomedes. If the tragedy was set before the king's palace, this moment will not have been enacted but reported in the prologue, perhaps by the nurse, like Phaedra's falling in love with Hippolytus in the prologue of Euripides' play. The scene in the mosaic is thus somewhat removed from the tragedy from which it was ultimately derived and may have been based on a narrative summary such as Hyginus's rather than a text of the tragedy itself. The nurse fits well into the dramatic scenario, but the mosaic's two Bacchants are probably part of the imagined ritual scene, perhaps alluding to a Dionysiac element in the plot, rather than a reminiscence of the play's chorus (»» Slater–Cropp 73f., 76, 80f.).

The origin of the story is unknown. Thestor was traditionally the father of Calchas (cf. Iliad *1.69), himself a seer and son of Apollo and sometimes one of the Argonauts (Schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.139, Tzetzes on Lycophron 427: »» Fowler 2013, 213f.). His daughters appear only in this story, and the whole adventure probably originated as a tragic plot, or a romance which a tragic poet then dramatized, in the Hellenistic period. It does not seem to be tied to a specific place or to have an aetiological purpose (Caria with its king Icarus seems to be just a convenient fictional location). Shorn Leucippes appear in other stories but are not obviously connected to the Leucippe of this story.*[1]

[1] In Achilles Tatius's novel *Leucippe and Clitophon* 5.17 (2nd C. AD**)** Clitophon fails to recognize the enslaved and shorn Leucippe, whom he believes to be dead, before being reunited with her. A 5th–6th C. papyrus text (P. Berlin 13927) has the text of a mime in which Leucippe is shorn by a barber. These and comparable stories are explored in Slater–Cropp 67–74.

ABBREVIATIONS AND REFERENCES

For standard abbreviations of classical authors and works see LSJ or *OCD*. Tragic fragments are cited from *TrGF*. Editions of classical texts are usually cited by editor's name (e.g. 'Ion F 108 Leurini', 'Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 218') or abbreviated title (e.g. *FGrH*, *PCG*).

AJPh *American Journal of Philology*

Beekes R. Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Two volumes. Leiden, 2009.

Blass–Debrunner F. Blass, A. Debrunner. *Grammatik des neutestamentlischen Griechisch*. Fourteenth edition revised by F. Rehkopf. Göttingen, 1976. (Translated with revisions from the ninth–tenth editions by R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literaure,* Chicago, 1961.)

BMCR *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*

BNJ *Brill's New Jacoby.* BrillOnline.

CAG *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca.* Many volumes. Berlin, 1884–1909.

CQ *Classical Quarterly*

DGE F. R. Adrados et al. *Diccionario Griego-Español.* Many volumes. Madrid, 1980– and online.

DK H. Diels, W. Kranz. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker.* Two volumes. Sixth edition. Berlin. 1951–52.

FGrH F. Jacoby *at al*. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Many volumes. Berlin, 1923–99. Also BrillOnline.

FRHist T. J. Cornell et al. *The Fragments of the Roman Historians.* Three volumes. Oxford, 2017.

GEF M. L. West. *Greek Epic Fragments*. Cambridge MA, 2003.

GRBS *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*

GrSat R. Krumeich, N. Pechstein, B. Seidensticker. *Das griechische Satyrspiel.* Darmstadt, 1999.

HSCPh *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*

IEG M. L. West. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*. Two volumes. Second edition. Oxford, 1989, 1992.

IG *Inscriptiones Graecae.* Many volumes. Berlin.

JHS *Journal of Hellenic Studies*

JSHRZ	*Jüdische Schriften aus der hellenistisch-römischer Zeit.* Many volumes. Berlin.
KG	R. Kühner, B. Gerth. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache.* Teil II. Two volumes. Third edition. Hannover, 1898.
Lampe	Lampe, G. 1961. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford.
LGGA	*Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity.* BrillOnline.
LGPN	*Lexicon of Greek Personal Names.* Many volumes. Oxford, 1987– . Also online.
LIMC	*Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae.* Nine volumes, each in two parts. Zurich, 1981–98.
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Ninth edition, revised by H. Stuart Jones and R. McKenzie. Oxford, 1940.
MusTr	B. Gauly et al. *Musa Tragica: die griechische Tragödie von Thespis bis Ezechiel.* Göttingen, 1991.
M–W	R. Merkelbach, M. L. West. *Fragmenta Hesiodea*. Oxford, 1967.
New Pauly	*Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World.* Many volumes. Leiden, 2002– . Also BrillOnline.
OCD	*The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Fourth edition. Oxford, 2012.
PBA	*Proceedings of the British Academy*
PCG	R. Kassel, C. Austin. *Poetae Comici Graeci*. Eight volumes in ten. Berlin. 1983– .
PCPhS	*Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*
PG	*Patrologia Graeca.* 161 volumes. Paris, 1857–66.
PMG	D. L. Page. *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford, 1962.
PMGF	M. Davies. *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.* Oxford, 1991.
P. Oxy.	*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri.* Many volumes. London.
PSI	*Papiri Greci e Latini.* Publicazzioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei papiri etc. Many volumes. Florence, 1912– .
QUCC	*Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*
RE	*Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft: neue Bearbeitung.* Many volumes. Stuttgart, 1894–1980.
RFIC	*Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*
RhM	*Rheinisches Museum*
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum.* Many volumes. Amsterdam, 1923– .
SEHT II	E. Csapo, P. Wilson. 2020. *A Social and Economic History of the Theatre to 300 BC.* Volume II. Cambridge.
SemRom	*Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca*

SGO	R. Merkelbach, J. Stauber. *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*. Five volumes. Stuttgart, Leipzig.
SH	H. Lloyd-Jones, P. Parsons. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin, 1983.
SSR	G. Giannantoni. *Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae.* Four volumes. Naples, 1990.
Stephanis	Stephanis, I. E. 1988. Διονυσιακοὶ Τεχνῖται, Συμβολὲς στὴν προσωπογραφία τοῦ θεάτρου καὶ τῆς μουσικῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων Ἑλλήνων. Iraklio.
TAPhA	*Transactions of the American Philological Association*
TrGF	B. Snell, R. Kannicht, S. Radt. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Five volumes in six. Göttingen, 1971–2004.
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

Adams, S. A. 2020. *Greek genres and Jewish authors: negotiating literary culture in the Greco-Roman era*. Waco.

Alpers, K. 1981. *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros*. Berlin.

Altheim, F. 1935. *Epochen der römischen Geschichte, II: Weltherrschaft und Krise*. Frankfurt.

Aneziri, S. 2003. *Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten im Kontext der hellenistischen Gesellschaft*. Stuttgart.

Aneziri, S. 2009. World travellers: the associations of artists of Dionysus. In R. Hunter, I. Rutherford (eds), *Wandering poets in ancient Greek culture: travel, locality and pan-Hellenism* (Cambridge): 217–36.

Argentieri, L. 1998. Epigramma e libro. Morfologia delle raccolte epigrammatiche premeleagree. *ZPE* 121: 1–20.

Arnott, W. G. 1979. *Menander, I.* Aspis *to* Epitrepontes. Cambridge MA, London.

Arnott, W. G. 1985. Ezekiel *Exagoge* 208. *AJPh* 106: 240–41.

Asmis, E. 1995. Philodemus on censorship, moral utility, and formalism in poetry. In D. Obbink (ed.), *Philodemus and Poetry* (Oxford): 148–77.

Atallah, W. 1966. *Adonis dans la littérature et l'art grecs.* Paris.

Austin, C. 1970. *Menander,* Aspis *et* Samia*, II: Subsidia interpretationis*. Berlin.

Bakola, E. 2010. *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy*. Oxford.

Barclay, J. 1996. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)*. Edinburgh.

Barrett, W. S. 1964. *Euripides: Hippolytos.* Oxford.

Bartalucci, A. 1970–71. Una probabile ricostruzione dell'*Eracle* di Diogene di Sinope. *Studi Classici e Orientali* 19–20: 109–22.

Bartoletti, V. 1966. Frammenti di un florilegio gnomologico in un papiro fiorentino. *In Atti dell'IX Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia. Milano, 2–8 settembre 1965* (Milan): 1–14.

Bartsch, H. 1843 *De Chaeremone Poeta Tragico.* Mainz.

Beazley, J. 1955. Hydria fragments in Corinth. *Hesperia* 25: 305–19.

Bélis, A. 2004. Un papyrus musical inédit au Louvre. *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres* 148.3: 1305–29.

Beloch, K. J. 1927. *Griechische Geschichte,* IV.2. Second edition. Berlin.

Bers. V. 1983. *Greek Poetic Syntax in the Classical Age.* New Haven.

Betegh, G. 2004. *The Derveni Papyrus: Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation.* Cambridge.

Bing, P. 1988 *The Well-Read Muse. Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets.* Göttingen.

Bloch. R. 2017. Part of the scene. Jewish theater in antiquity. *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 8: 150–69.

Blundell, S. 1986. *The Origins of Civilisation in Greek and Roman Thought.* London.

Bollansée, J. 1999. Hermippos of Smyrna and his biographical writings: a reappraisal. Leuven.

Bond, G. W. 1981. *Euripides: Heracles*. Oxford.

Bosher, K. 2006. *Theater on the Periphery. A social and political history of theater in early Sicily*. Diss. Michigan.

Bosher, K. 2021. *Greek Theater in Ancient Sicily*. Cambridge.

Bosher, K. (ed.). 2012. *Theater Outside Athens. Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy.* Cambridge.

Brancacci, A. 1977. Le orazioni diogeniane di Dione Crisostomo. In G. Giannantoni (ed.), *Scuole socratiche minori e filosofia ellenistica* (Bologna): 141–71.

Branham, R., M.-O. Goulet-Cazé (eds). 1996. *The Cynics: the Cynic movement in antiquity and its legacy*. Berkeley.

Braund, D. 2019. Theatre and performance in the Bosporan kingdom. In Braund et al. 2019: 82–105.

Braund, D., E. Hall, R. Wyles (eds). 2019. *Ancient Theatre and Performance Culture around the Black Sea.* Cambridge.

Brink, C. O. 1971. *Horace on Poetry: The 'Ars Poetica'*. Cambridge.

Brisson, L. 1985. La figure de Chronos dans la théogonie orphique et ses antécédents iraniens. In D. Tiffeneau (ed.), *Mythes et représentations du temps* (Paris): 37–55.

Brisson, L. 1997. Chronos in column XII of the Derveni papyrus. In A. Laks, G. Most (eds), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus* (Oxford): 149–66.

Brizi, G. 1928. Il mito di Telefo nei tragici greci. *Atene e Roma* 9: 95–145.

Brown, C. G. 1990. Philicus' Hymn to Demeter. *Aegyptus* 70: 173–89.

Brown, M. K. 2002. *The* Narratives *of Konon*. Munich.

Bruchmann, C. F. 1893. *Epitheta deorum quae apud poetas graecos leguntur.* Leipzig.

Bryant Davies, R. 2008. Reading Ezekiel's *Exagoge*: tragedy, sacrificial ritual, and the Midrashic tradition. *GRBS* 48: 393–415.

Bühler, W. 1973. Tzetzes über die Ἕκτορος λύτρα des Dionysios. *ZPE* 11: 69–79.

Bühler, W. 1999 *Zenobii Athoi Proverbia: 5, Libri secundi proverbia 41–108 complexum etc.* Göttingen.

Burgess, J. 2001 *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle.* Baltimore and London.

Burkert, W. 1983. *Homo Necans. The anthropology of ancient Greek sacrificial ritual and myth*. Transl. P. Bing. Berkeley (orig. German, Berlin, 1972).

Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion: archaic and classical*. Transl. J. Raffan. Oxford (orig. German, Stuttgart, 1977).

Burkert, W. 2009. Medea: Arbeit am Mythos von Eumelos bis Karkinos. in B. Zimmermann (ed.), *Mythische Wiederkehr: der Ödipus- und Medea-Mythos im Wandel der Zeiten* (Freiburg): 153–66.

Burnett, A. P. 1971. *Catastrophe Survived. Euripides' plays of mixed reversal.* Oxford.

Cairns, F. 2016. *Hellenistic Epigrams: contexts of exploration.* Cambridge.

Calder, W. 1966. A reconstruction of Sophocles' *Polyxena*. *GRBS* 7: 31–56.

Campbell, D. A. 1993. *Greek Lyric V.* Cambridge MA, London.

Cameron, A. 2004. *Greek Mythography in the Roman World.* New York.

Cantarella, R. 1952. Il frammento di Ossirinco su Gige. *Dioniso* 15: 3–31.

Caroli, M. 2020. *Studi sulle seconde edizioni del dramma tragico.* Bari.

Carrara, P. 2007. Editori e commentari di Euripide della prima età ellenistica. In Pretagostini–Dettori 2007: 247–55.

Carrara, P. 2012. Nota al frammento 14 dell'*Eneo* di Cheremone. In G. Bastianini et al., *Harmonia. Scritti . . . in onore di A. Casanova* (Florence): I.195–202.

Carrara, P. 2018. La Pleiade tragica nel contesto della produzione ellenistica. *Prometheus* 44: 104–21.

Carter, D. 2019. Society and politics in post-fifth-century tragedy. In Liapis–Petrides 2019: 270–94.

Cataudella, Q. 1929. Il frammento 1 di Cheremone. *RFIC* 7: 241–3.

Cataudella, Q. 1957. Sulla cronologia del cosidetto 'Frammento di Gige'. In *Studi in onore di A. Calderini e R. Paribeni* (Milan): II.103–16 (= Cataudella, *Saggi sulla tragedia Greca*, Messina, 1969: 43–65).

Catenacci, C. 2002. Un frammento di tragedia ellenistica (P.Oxy. 2746 = TrGF adesp. 649). *QUCC* n.s. 70.1: 95–104.

Caven, B. 1990. *Dionysius I, War-lord of Sicily.* New Haven.

Cesaretti, P., S. Ronchey. 2014. *Eustathii Thessalonicensis exegesis in canonem iambicum pentecostalem.* Göttingen.

Charlesworth, J. H. 1985. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, II: Expansions of the 'Old Testament' and legends etc.* Cambridge.

Cipolla, P. 2003 *Poeti minori del dramma satiresco.* Amsterdam.

Clauss, J., M. Cuypers (eds). 2010. *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature.* Malden MA, Oxford.

Clinton, H. F. 1840 *Fasti Hellenici. The Civil and Literary Chronology of Greece.* Third edition. Oxford.

Clinton, K. 2005–8. *Eleusis. The Inscriptions on Stone.* Two volumes in three parts. Athens.

Cole, T. 1990. *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology.* Second edition (orig. 1967). Atlanta.

Coles, R. A. 1968. A new fragment of post-classical tragedy from Oxyrhynchus. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 15: 110–9.

Collard, C. 1970. On the tragedian Chaeremon. *JHS* 90: 22–34.

Collard, C. 2007. *Tragedy, Euripides and Euripideans*. *Selected Papers.* Bristol.

Collard, C., M. Cropp. 2008a. *Euripides Fragments: Aegeus–Meleager*. Cambridge MA, London.

Collard, C., M. Cropp. 2008b. *Euripides Fragments: Oedipus–Chrysippus, Other Fragments*. Cambridge MA, London.

Collard, C., M. J. Cropp, J. Gibert. 2004. *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays, II.* Oxford.

Collard, C., M. J. Cropp, K. H. Lee. 2009. *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays*, *I.* Revised edition (orig. 1995). Oxford.

Collins, J. 2000. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish identity in the Hellenistic diaspora.* Second edition. Grand Rapids.

Collins, N. 1991. Ezekiel, the author of the *Exagoge*: his calendar and home. *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 22: 201–11.

Cooper, L. 1929. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.16.1417 b 16–20. *AJPh* 50: 170–80.

Corbett, P., D. Strong. 1961. Three Roman silver cups. *British Museum Quarterly* 23.3: 68–86.

Cousland, J. R. C. and J. R. Hume (eds). 2009. *The Play of Texts and Fragments: Essays in honour of Martin Cropp*. Leiden.

Cozzoli, A.-T. 2003. Sositeo e il nuovo dramma satiresco. In A. Martina (ed.), *Teatro greco postclassico e teatro latine: teorie e prassi drammatica: Atti del convegno internazionale, Roma, 16–18 ottobre 2001* (Rome): 265–91.

Crönert, W. 1911. De Lobone Argivo. In *ΧΑΡΙΤΕΣ Friedrich Leo zum sechsigsten Geburtstag dargebracht* (Berlin): 123–45.

Cropp, M. J. 2005. Review of Morelli 2001. *Classical Review* 55: 419–21.

Cropp. M. J. 2020a. The Tactful Chorus: Euripides, *Alcestis* 326–327, *Hecuba* 846–849. *Mouseion* 17, Suppl. 1: 43–56.

Cropp. M. J. 2020b. Euripides or Critias, or Neither? Reflections on an unresolved question. In A. Lamari at al. (eds), *Fragmentation in Ancient Greek Drama* (Berlin): 235–56.

Cropp, M. J., G. H. Fick. 1985. *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides: the fragmentary tragedies. BICS* Suppl. 43. London.

Cropp, M. J., I. C. Storey. 2018. Patrocles of Athens and Patrocles of Thurii. *JHS* 138: 50–54.

Crusius, O. 1890. Review of Nauck 1889. *Göttingsche Gelehrte Anzeigen* 1890: 687–704.

Csapo, E. 2010. *Actors and Icons of the Ancient Theater.* Malden MA, Oxford.

Csapo, E., P. Wilson. 2015. Drama Outside Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC. In Lamari (ed.) 2015: 316–95.

Csapo, E., H. Goette, J. R. Green, P. Wilson (eds). 2014. *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B.C.* Berlin.

Curd, P. 2010. *Anaxagoras of Clazomenae: Fragments and Testimonia*. Toronto.

Dangel, J. 2002. *Accius, Oeuvres. Fragments.* Paris.

D'Anna, G. 1967. *M. Pacuvii Fragmenta*. Rome.

Davies, M. 2019. *The Cypria*. Washington, D.C.

Davies, M., P. J. Finglass. 2014. *Stesichorus. The Poems.* Cambridge.

Del Grande, C. 1933–34. Teodette di Faselide e la tarda tragedia posteuripidea. *Dioniso* 4: 191–210.

Denniston, J. D. 1954. *The Greek Particles.* Second edition. Oxford.

De Romilly, J. 1968. *Time in Greek Tragedy*. Ithaca NY.

Desmond, W. D. 2008. *Cynics*. Berkeley.

Dettori, E. 1997. Aristotele, *Poetica* 1455a22–29. In B. Zimmermann (ed.), *Griechisch-römische Komödie und Tragödie II* (Stuttgart): 75–84.

Dickie, M. W. 1998. Poets as initiates in the Mysteries: Euphorion, Philicus and Posidippus. *Antike und Abendland* 44: 49–77.

Dieleman, J., I. Moyer. 2010. Egyptian Literature. In Clauss–Cuypers 2010: 429–47.

Diggle, J. 1998. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Selecta.* Oxford.

Dihle, E. 1936. Nikomachos (14). *RE* 17, 460f.

DiTommaso, L. 2001. *A Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research 1850–1999*. Sheffield.

Dodds, E. R. 1973. *The Ancient Concept of Progress and other essays on Greek literature and belief.* Oxford.

Dolfi, E. 2006. Sul fr. 14 di Cheremone. *Prometheus* 32: 43–54.

Domingo Gygax, M. 2016 *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City: The Origins of Euergetism.* Cambridge.

Donzelli, G. 1965. Del Tieste di Diogene di Sinope in Diog. Lae. VI, 73. *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* n.s. 37: 241–58.

Dorandi, T. 1982. Filodemo. Gli Stoici (PHerc. 155 e 399). *Cronache Ercolanesi* 12: 91–133.

Dorandi, T. 1994. *Filodemo. Storia dei Filosofi: La Stoà da Zenone a Panezio (PHerc. 1018)*. Leiden.

Döring, K. 1993. Spielereien, mit verdecktem Ernst vermischt: Unterhaltsame Formen literarischer Wissensvermittlung bei Diogenes von Sinope und den frühen Kynikern. In W. Kullmann, J. Althoff (eds), *Vermittlung und Tradierung von Wissen in der griechischen Kultur* (Tübingen): 337–52.

Dreyfus, R., E. Schraudolph. 1996–97. *Pergamon: the Telephos Frieze from the Great Altar*. Two volumes. San Franciso.

Dübner, F. 1846. *Christus Patiens, Ezechieli et Christianorum Poetarum Reliquiae Dramaticae*. In F. W. Wagner, *Fragmenta Euripidis iterum edidit etc.* (Paris).

Dudley, D. R. 1937. *A History of Cynicism.* London.

Dümmler, F. 1882. *Antisthenica.* Berlin.

Dunbabin, K. 2010. The pantomime Theonoe on a mosaic from Zeugma. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 23: 413–426.

Duncan, A. 2012. A Theseus outside Athens. Dionysius I of Syracuse and tragic self-presentation. In Bosher (ed.) 2012: 137–55.

Duncan, A., V. Liapis. 2019. Theatre performance after the fifth century. In Liapis–Petrides 2019: 180–203.

Dunn, F. The fifth century and after: (dis)continuities in Greek tragedy. In Liapis–Petrides 2019: 243–69.

Easterling, P. E. 1993. The end of an era? Tragedy in the early fourth century. In Sommerstein (ed.) 1993: 559–69.

Easterling, P. E. 2002. Actor as Icon. In Easterling and Hall (eds) 2002: 327–41.

Easterling, P. E. 2005. *Agamemnon* for the ancients. In F. Macintosh, E. Hall (eds), *Agamemnon in Performance, 458 BC to AD 2004* (Oxford): 23–36.

Easterling, P. E., E. Hall (eds). 2002. *Greek and Roman Actors. Aspects of an ancient profession.* Cambridge.

Edelstein, L. 1967. *The Idea of Progress in Classical Antiquity.* Baltimore.

Else, G. 1957. *Aristotle's Poetics: the argument.* Cambridge MA, Leiden.

Fantham, E. 1982. *Seneca: Troades*. Princeton.

Fantham, E. 2001. Roman tragedy and the teaching of Aristotle's *Poetics*. In Ø. Andersen, J. Haarberg (eds), *Making Sense of Aristotle's* Poetics (London): 109–25.

Fantham, E. 2003. Pacuvius: melodrama, reversals and recognitions. In D. Braund, C. Gill (eds), *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome: Studies in honour of T. P. Wiseman* (Exeter): 98–118.

Fantuzzi, M. 1989. L'ambigua prigione di Antigone. In L. de Finis (ed.), *Scena e spettacolo in antichità* (Florence): 193–203.

Fantuzzi, M. 1993. Il sistema letterario della poesia Alessandrina nel III sec. a.C. In G. Cambiano et al. (eds), *Lo Spazio letterario della Greca antica, 2. L'Ellenismo* (Rome): 31–73.

Fantuzzi, M. 2007a. Dioscoride e la storia del teatro. In Pretagostini–Dettori 2007: 105–23.

Fantuzzi, M. 2007b. Epigram and theater. In P. Bing, J. S. Bruss (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden): 475–95.

Fantuzzi, M. 2007c. Mescolare il ludicro al serio: la poetica del corcirese Filico e l'edonismo dei Feaci (*SH* 980). In G. Lozza, S. Martinelli Tempesta (eds), *L'Epigramma greco: problemi e prospettivi* (Milan): 53–68.

Fantuzzi, M. 2012. *Achilles in Love. Intertextual Studies.* Oxford.

Fantuzzi, M. 2020a. *The Rhesus attributed to Euripides.* Cambridge.

Fantuzzi, M. 2020b. *Rhesus.* In A. Markantonatos (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Euripides* (Leiden): I.415–39.

Fantuzzi, M., R. Hunter. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry.* Cambridge.

Farmer, M. 2017. *Tragedy on the Comic Stage.* New York.

Fehling, D. 1985. *Die sieben Weisen und die frühgriechische Chronologie.* Bern.

Fernández Galiano, M. 1978. Sobre el fragmento trágico del P. Oxy. 2746. *Museum Philologum Londiniense* 3: 139–41.

Ferrari, F. 2009. L'altra Cassandra: *adesp. trag.* fr. 649 *TrGF*. *SemRom* 12: 21–36.

Finglass, P. J. 2015. Ancient reperformances of Sophocles. In Lamari (ed.) 2015: 207–23.

Finglass, P. J. 2016. A new fragment of Sophocles' *Tereus*. *ZPE* 200: 61–85.

Finglass, P. J. 2017. Electra. In R. Lauriola, K. Demetriou (eds), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Sophocles* (Leiden): 475–511.

Fortuna, S. 1993. Sofocle, Sositeo, il dramma satiresco (Disocoride, *AP* VII 37 e 707). *Aevum Antiquum* 6: 237–49.

Fountoulakis, A. 1995–96. Greek dramatic conventions in Ezekiel's *Exagôgê*. *Platon* 47–48: 88–112.

Fountoulakis, A. 2017. When Dionysus goes to the East: on the dissemination of Greek Drama beyond Athens. In A. Fountoulakis et al. (eds), *Theatre World: Perspectives on Greek Tragedy and Comedy* (Berlin): 75–117.

Fowler, R. L. 2013. *Early Greek Mythography, 2: Commentary.* Oxford.

Fraser, P. M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Three volumes. Oxford.

Frazer, J. G. 1921. *Apollodorus: The Library*. Two volumes. London, Cambridge MA.

Fries, A. 2014. *Pseudo-Euripides:* Rhesus*.* Berlin.

Fries, A. 2019. The *Rhesus*. In Liapis–Petrides 2019: 66–89.

Furley, W. D. 2009. Philikos' 'Hymn to Demeter'. *Paideia* 64: 483–508.

Gabathuler, M. 1937. *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter.* Diss. Basel.

Gainsford, P. 2012. Diktys of Crete. *Cambridge Classical Journal* 58: 58–87.

Gallo, I. 1978. Un frammento di dramma ellenistico nell' *Index Stoicorum* ercolanense. *QUCC* 27: 161–79.

Gallo, I. 1998. Il fr. 6 Sn.-K. di Moschione: una teoria 'laica' dell'umano progresso nella tragedia ellenistica. *Eikasmos* 9: 107–19.

Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth.* Baltimore.

Garulli, V. 2004. *Il* Περί ποιητῶν *di Lobone di Argo*. Bologna.

Garzya, A. 1993. 'Dramma di Gige', o 'di Candaule'? In R. Pretagostini (ed.), *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica: scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili* (Rome), II.547–49.

Geffcken, J. 1891. Zwei Dramen des Lykophron. *Hermes* 26: 33–42.

Gentili, B. 1979. Language and metre in a new tragic text of the Hellenistic period. In Gentili, *Theatrical Performances in the Ancient World* (Amsterdam): 66–97. Orig. Italian, *Museum Philologum Londiniense* 2 (1977): 127–46 = *Lo spettacolo nel mondo antico* (Rome, 1977), 63–88.

George, C. 2005. *Expressions of Agency in Ancient Greek.* Cambridge.

Gifford, E. H. 1903. *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis Libri XV.* Two volumes. Oxford.

Gigante, M. 1952. Un nuovo frammento di Licofrone tragico. *La Parola del Passato* 7: 5–17.

Gigante, M. 1979. *Civiltà delle forme letterarie nell' antica Pompeii*. Naples.

Gildersleeve, B. 1911. *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes.* Second part. New York. Reprinted with Part 1 (1900) and Index of passages cited, Groningen, 1980.

Girardi, G. B. 1902. *Di un dramma greco-giudaico nell'età alessandrina.* Venice.

Giuliani, L. 1995. *Tragik, Trauer und Trost: Bildervasen für eine apulische Totenfeier*. Berlin.

Giuliani, L., G. Most. 2007. Medea in Eleusis, in Princeton. In C. Kraus et al., *Visualizing the Tragic: Drama, myth and ritual in Greek art and literature* (Oxford): 197–217.

Giuseppetti, M. 2012. Two poets for a goddess: Callimachus' and Philicus' Hymns to Demeter. In M. A. Harder et al. (eds), *Gods and Religion in Hellenistic Poetry* (Groningen): 103–29.

Gmirkin, R. 2006. *Berossus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus. Hellenistic histories and the date of the Pentateuch*. New York, London, 2006.

Goldberg, S., G. Manuwald. 2018. *Fragmentary Republican Latin, II. Ennius: Dramatic Fragments, Minor Works.* Cambridge MA, London.

Gomme, A. W., F. Sandbach. 1973. *Menander. A Commentary.* Oxford.

Gomperz, T. 1866. *Philodem über Frommigkeit.* Herculanische Studien II. Leipzig.

Goodwin W. W. 1889. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb.* London, New York.

Görkay, K., P. Linant de Bellefonds, E. Prioux. 2006. Some observations on the Theonoe mosaic from Zeugma. *Anadolu/Anatolia* 31: 1–14.

Goulet-Cazé, M.-O. 1986. *L'Ascèse Cynique. Un commentaire de Diogène Laerce VI 70–71.* Paris.

Goulet-Cazé, M.-O. 2003. *Les* Kynika *du stoïcisme.* Wiesbaden.

Goulet-Cazé, M.-O. 2017. *Le cynisme, une philosophie antique*. Paris.

Gow, A. 1950. *Theocritus*. Two volumes. Cambridge.

Gow, A., D. L Page. 1965. *The Greek Anthology, Hellenistic Epigrams*. Two volumes. Cambridge.

Graf, F. 1973. *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit*. Berlin.

Green, J. R. 2002. Review of Morelli 2001. *BMCR* 2002.12.01.

Griffin, J. 2006. Herodotus and tragedy. In C. Dewald, J. Marincola (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge): 46–59.

Griffith, M. 2008. Greek middlebrow drama (something to do with Aphrodite?). In Revermann–Wilson 2008: 59–87 (= Griffith, *Greek Satyr Play: Five Studies*, Berkeley, 2015: 146–69).

Griffith, M. 2019. Music and dance in tragedy after the fifth century. In Liapis–Petrides 2019: 204–42.

Grilli, A. 1975. La vicenda di Oreste e Ifigenia in Igino (*Fab.* 120–121). *RFIC* 103: 154–56.

Grossardt, P. 2001. *Die Erzählung von Meleagros. Zur literarischen Entwicklung der Kalydonischen Kulturlegende.* Leiden.

Grossardt, P. 2005. Zum Inhalt der *Hektoros Lytra* des Dionysios I. *RhM* 148: 225–41.

Gruen, E. 2002. *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greek and Romans.* Cambridge MA.

Gutzwiller, K. 2008. Review of Garulli 2004. *BMCR* 2008.01.48.

Gutzwiller, K. 2010. Literary Criticism. In Clauss–Cuypers 2010: 337–65.

Hagel, S. 2010. *Ancient Greek Music. A New Technical History.* Cambridge.

Hall, E. 2002. The singing actors of antiquity. In Easterling and Hall (eds) 2002: 3–38.

Hall, E. 2007. Greek Tragedy 430–380 BC. In R. Osborne (ed.), *Debating the Athenian Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge): 264–87.

Hall, E. 2008. Can the *Odyssey* ever be tragic? Historical perspectives on the theatrical realization of Greek epic. In Revermann–Wilson 2008: 499–523.

Hall, E. 2013. *Adventures with Iphigenia in Tauris. A cultural history of Euripides' Black Sea tragedy.* Oxford.

Hall, E. 2019. The tragedians of Heraclea and the comedians of Sinope. In Braund et al. 2019: 45–58.

Hanink, J. 2014. *Lycurgan Athens and the Making of Classical Tragedy*. Cambridge.

Harder, R. 1943. *Karpokrates von Chalkis und die memphitische Isispropaganda*. Berlin.

Haslam, M. 1975. The authenticity of Euripides, *Phoenissae* 1–2 and Sophocles, *Electra* 1. *GRBS* 16: 149–74.

Haupt, M. 1869. Analecta. *Hermes* 3: 140–55 (= *Opuscula* III, Leipzig, 1876: 392–408).

Haupt, M. 1870. Varia. *Hermes* 4: 326–45 (= *Opuscula* III, Leipzig, 1876: 470–89).

Haynes, S. 1961. Drei neuer Silberbecher im British Museum. *Antike Kunst* 4.1: 30–36.

Headlam, W. 1904. On some tragic fragments. *Classical Review* 18: 430–31.

Heath, J. 2006. Ezekiel Tragicus and Hellenistic visuality: the Phoenix at Elim. *Journal of Theological Studies* 57: 23–41.

Heiden, B. 2008. Common people and leaders in *Iliad* Book 2: the invocation of the Muses and the Catalogue of Ships. *TAPhA* 138: 127–54.

Heitsch, E. 1961. *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Vol. 1, second edition. Göttingen.

Henrichs, A. 1975. Philodems *De Pietate* als mythographische Quelle. *Cronache Ercolanesi* 5: 5–38.

Heres, H. 1997. The myth of Telephos in Pergamon. In Dreyfus–Schraudolph 1996–97: II.83–108.

Herington, J. 1973. Review of *TrGF* I. *Classical World* 66: 463–64.

Herwerden, H. van. 1862. *Exercitationes criticae in poeticis etc.* The Hague.

Hill, D. E. 1973. The Thessalian trick. *RhM* 116: 221–38.

Hoffmann, H. 1951. *Chronologie der attischen Tragödie.* Diss. Hamburg.

Holladay, C. R. 1983. *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors. I. Historians.* Chico CA.

Holladay, C. R. 1989. *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors. II. Poets.* Atlanta.

Holzberg, N. 1973. Zur Datierung der Gygestragödie P. Ox. 2382. *Živa Antika* 23: 273–86.

Hook, B. 2005. Oedipus and Thyestes among the Philosophers: incest and cannibalism in Plato, Diogenes, and Zeno. *Classical Philology* 100: 17–40.

Horbury, W. 1986. Ezekiel Tragicus 106, δωρήματα. *Vetus Testamentum* 36: 37–51. Revised in Horbury, *Messianism Among Jews and Christians: Biblical and Historical Studies* (London, New York, 2003): 65–82.

Hornblower, S. 1982. *Mausolus*. Oxford.

Hornblower, S. 2015. *Lykophron*: Alexandra. Oxford.

Hornblower, S. 2019. Hellenistic tragedy and satyr-drama; Lycophron's *Alexandra*. Liapis–Petrides 2019: 90–124.

Hunter, R. 1983. *Eubulus: The Fragments.* Cambridge.

Huxley, G. 1965. Ion of Chios. *GRBS* 6: 29–46.

Huys. M. 1995. *The Tale of the Hero who was Exposed at Birth in Euripidean Tragedy: A Study of Motifs*. Leuven.

Jackson, L. 2020. *The Chorus of Drama in the Fourth Century BCE*. Oxford.

Jacobson, H. 1981a. Two Studies on Ezekiel the Tragedian. *GRBS* 22: 167–78.

Jacobson, H. 1981b. Mysticism and apocalyptic in Ezechiel's Exagoge. *Illinois Classical Studies* 6: 272–93.

Jacobson, H. 1981c. The identity and role of Chum in Ezekiel's *Exagoge*. *Hebrew University Studies in Literature* 9: 139–46.

Jacobson, H. 1983. *The* Exagoge *of Ezekiel.* Cambridge.

Jacobson, H. 2003. Ezekiel's *Exagoge*, One Play or Four? *GRBS* 43: 391–96.

Jacoby, F. 1903. Sosiphanes. *RhM* 58: 459–61.

Janko, R. 1987. *Aristotle:* Poetics *I with the* Tractatus Coislinianus *etc.* Indianapolis.

Janko, R. 2000. *Philodemus.* On Poems*, Book 1*. Oxford.

Janko, R. 2011. *Philodemus.* On Poems*, Books 3–4, with the fragments of Aristotle,* On Poets. Oxford.

Janko, R. 2020. *Philodemus.* On Poems*, Book 2, with the fragments of Heracleodorus and Pausimachus*. Oxford.

Jocelyn, H. 1967. *The Tragedies of Ennius.* Cambridge.

Jones, H. L. 1910. *The Poetic Plural of Greek Tragedy in the light of Homeric Usage.* Ithaca NY.

Kakridis, J. 1951. Ἡ γυναῖκα τοῦ Κανδαύλη. Μία ἀγνώστη τραγῳδία. *Hellenika* 12: 1–14.

Kaldellis, A. 2007. Christodoros on the Statues of the Zeuxippos Baths: A new reading of the *Ekphrasis*. *GRBS* 47: 361–383.

Kamerbeek, J. 1938, De novo fragmento tragico. *Mnemosyne* ser. 3, 6: 335–49.

Kamerbeek, J. 1952, De novo fragmento tragico in quo de Gyge et Candaule agitur. *Mnemosyne* ser. 4, 5: 108–115.

Kappelmacher, A. 1924–25. Zur Tragödie der hellenistischen Zeit. *Wiener Studien* 44: 69–86.

Karamanou, I. 2017. *Euripides:* Alexandros. Berlin.

Karamanou, I. 2019. *Refiguring Tragedy. Studies in plays preserved in fragments and their reception.* Berlin.

Kassel, R. 1958. *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur.* Munich.

Kassel, R. 1966. Kritische und exegetische Kleinigkeiten II. *RhM* 109: 1–12.

Kayser, W. C. 1845. *Historia Critica Tragicorum Graecorum.* Göttingen.

Keddie, G., J. MacLellan. 2017. Ezekiel's *Exagoge* and the politics of Hellenistic theatre. *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 8: 170–87.

Kertész, I. 1982. Der Telephos-Mythos und der Telephos-Fries. *Oikumene* 3: 203–15.

Köhler, L. 1928. *Die Briefe des Sokrates und der Sokratiker*. *Philologus* Suppl. 20.2. Leipzig.

Kohn, T. 2003. The tragedies of Ezekiel. *GRBS* 43: 5–12.

Konstan, D. 2017. Mankind's Past: evolution or progress? In S. Rocchi, C. Mussini (eds), *Imagines Antiquitatis: Representations, Concepts, Receptions of the Past in Roman Antiquity etc.* (Berlin): 17–26.

Körte, A. 1939. Literarische Texte mit Ausschluss der christlichen. *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 10: 19–70.

Kosmetatou, E. 2003a. Reassessing *IG* II² 1498–1501A: *kathairesis* or *eksetasmos*? *Tyche* 18: 33–45.

Kosmetatou, E. 2003b. The Attalids of Pergamon. In A. Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (Malden MA, Oxford): 159–74.

Kotlińska-Toma, A. 2015. *Hellenistic Tragedy: texts, translations and a critical survey*. London.

Kowalzig, B. 2008. Nothing to do with Demeter? Something to do with Sicily! Theatre and society in the early fifth-century west. In Revermann–Wilson 2008: 128–57.

Kraus, Chr. S. 1968. Ezechiele poeta tragico. *RFIC* 96: 164–75.

Kucewicz, C. 2016. Mutilation of the dead and Homeric gods. *CQ* 66: 425–36.

Kuch, H. 1993. Continuity and change in Greek tragedy in the early fourth century. In Sommerstein (ed.) 1993: 545–57.

Kuiper, K. 1900. De Ezechiele poeta Iudaeo. *Mnemosyne* 28: 237–80.

Kuiper, K. 1904. Ad Ezechielem poetam Judaeum curae secundae. *Rivista di Storia Antica* 8: 62–94.

Kwapisz, J. 2013. Were there Hellenistic riddle books? In J. Kwapisz, D. Petrain, M. Szymański (eds), *The Muse at Play: riddles and wordplay in Greek and Latin poetry* (Berlin): 148–67.

Lamari, A. 2017. *Reperforming Greek tragedy. Theater, politics, and cultural mobility in the fifth and fourth centuries BC.* Berlin.

Lamari A. (ed.). 2015. *Reperformances of Drama in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC: authors and contexts. Trends in Classics* 7.2. Berlin.

Lanfranchi, P. 2006. *L'Exagoge d'Ezéchiel le Tragique*. Leiden.

Lanfranchi, P. 2007a. Moïse l'étranger: l'image du xénos dans l'*Exagoge d'Ézéchiel le tragique*. In J. Riaud (ed.), *L'étranger dans la Bible et ses lectures* (Paris): 249–60.

Lanfranchi, P. 2007b. Moses' vision of the divine throne in the *Exagoge* of Ezechiel the Tragedian. In H. de Jonge and J. Tromp (eds), *The Book of Ezekiel and its Influence* (Aldershot): 53–59.

Lanfranchi, P. 2018. The *Exagôgê* of Ezekiel the tragedian. In Liapis–Petrides 2018: 125–46.

Latte, K. 1925. Reste Frühhellenistischer Poetik im Pisonenbrief des Horaz. *Hermes* 60: 1–13 (= 1968: 885–95).

Latte, K. 1950. Ein antikes Gygesdrama. *Eranos* 48: 136–41 (= 1968: 585–89).

Latte, K. 1954. Der Demeterhymnos des Philikos. *Museum Helveticum* 11: 1–19 (= 1968: 539–61).

Latte, K. 1968. *Kleine Schriften*. Munich.

Le Guen, B. 2001. *Les associations de technites dionysiaques à l'époque hellénistique*. Two volumes. Paris.

Le Guen, B. 2007. 'Décadence' d'un genre? Les auteurs de tragédie et leurs oeuvres à la période hellénistique. In B. Le Guen (ed.), *À chacun sa tragédie? Retour sur la tragédie grecque* (Rennes): 85–139.

Le Guen, B. 2019. Beyond Athens: the expansion of Greek tragedy from the fourth century onwards. In Liapis–Petrides 2019: 149–79.

Lehnardt, A. 1999. *Bibliographie zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*. *JSHRZ* VI, Supp. 2. Gütersloh.

Leone, P. 1992–93. Miscellanea Critica, 1. *Quaderni Catanesi di Cultura Classica e Medievale* 4–5: 59–70.

Lesky, A. 1953. Das Hellenistische Gyges-Drama. *Hermes* 81: 1–10 (= *Gesammelte Schriften*, Berne, 1966: 204–12).

Lesky, A. 1977. Tragödien bei Herodot? In K. H. Kinzl (ed.), *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in ancient history and prehistory. Studies presented to Fritz Schachermeyr etc.* (Berlin): 224–30.

Lewis, D. M. 1994. Sicily, 413–368 B.C. In *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Second edition, Vol. 6: 120–55.

Liapis, V. 2009. *Rhesus* revisited: the case for a fourth-century Macedonian context. *JHS* 129: 71–88.

Liapis, V. 2014. *A Commentary on the* Rhesus *attributed to Euripides*. Oxford.

Liapis, V. 2016. On the *Hector* of Astydamas. *AJPh* 137: 61–89.

Liapis, V. 2017a. A note on the text of Chaeremon's *Alphesiboea* (*TrGF* 1 71 F 1). *Frammenti sulla scena* 1: 151–56.

Liapis, V. 2017b. *Rhesus*. In L. McClure (ed.), *A Companion to Euripides* (Malden MA, Oxford, 2017): 360–73.

Liapis, V., A. Petrides (eds). 2019. *Greek Tragedy after the Fifth Century: a survey from the fourth century BC to the fourth century AD*. Cambridge.

Liapis, V., T. Stephanopoulos. 2019. Greek tragedy in the fourth century: the fragments. In Liapis–Petrides 2019: 25–65.

Liddel, P. 2020. *Decrees of Fourth-Century Athens (403/2–322/1 BC).* Two volumes. Cambridge.

Lightfoot, J. 1999. *Parthenius of Nicaea*. Oxford.

Lightfoot, J. 2002. Nothing to do with the τεχνῖται of Dionysus? In Easterling and Hall (eds) 2002: 209–24.

Lightfoot, J. 2009. *Hellenistic Collection: Philitas, Alexander of Aetolia, Hermesianax, Euphorion, Parthenius*. Cambridge MA, London.

Lloyd-Jones, H., P. Parsons. 1983. *Supplementum Hellenisticum.* Berlin.

Lobel, E. 1936. A tragic fragment on a papyrus in the Bodleian Library. In *Greek Poetry and Life*. *Essays presented to G. Murray etc.* (Oxford): 295–98.

Lobel, E. 1949. A Greek historical drama. *PBA* 35: 207–16.

Long, A. A. 1978. Timon of Phlius: Pyrrhonist and satirist. *PCPhS* 24: 68–91.

López Cruces, J. 2003a. Diógenes y sus tragedias a luz de la comedia. *Ítaca* 19: 47–69.

López Cruces, J. 2003b. Une *Antiope* cynique? *Prometheus* 29: 17–36.

López Cruces, J. 2008. El *Aquiles* de Diógenes o la negación de la bella muerte. In J. Bañuls et al. (eds), *Teatro y sociedad en la Antigüedad clásica: las relaciones de poder en época de crisis* (Bari): 189–217.

López Cruces, J. 2010. Une tragédie perdue: L'*Héraclès* de Diogène le cynique. *Les Études Classiques* 78: 3–24.

López Cruces, J., J. Campos Daroca. 1998–99. Physiologie, langage, éthique: une reconstruction de l' *Œdipe* de Diogène de Sinope. *Ítaca* 14–15: 43–65.

Lowe, N. 2013. Comedy and the Pleiad: Alexandrian tragedians and the birth of comic scholarship. In E. Bakola et al., *Greek Comedy and the Discourse of Genres* (Cambridge): 343–356.

Lucarini, C. 2013. Il monologo di Medea (Eurip. *Med.*, 1056–1080) e le altre *Medee* dell'antichità (con *Appendice* su Carcino). *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* ser. 5.5: 164–96.

Lupi, F. 2017. Su due frammenti tragici di autore incerto: Diogene di Sinope o Euripide? *Prometheus* 43: 67–86.

Luppe, W. 1969. Zu einen Choregeninschrift aus Aixone (IG II/III^2 3091). *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 19: 147–51.

Luppe, W. 1974. Nochmals zur Choregeninschrift IG II/III^2 3091. *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 22/23: 211–12.

Luppe, W. 1983. Atlas-Zitate im 1. Buch von Philodems De pietate. *Cronache Ercolanesi* 13: 45–52.

Luz, Chr. 2010. *Technopaignia. Formspiele in der griechischen Dichtung*. Leiden.

Ma, J. 2013. *Statues and Cities. Honorific portraits and civic identity in the Hellenistic world.* Oxford.

Maas, P. 1950. Review of Lobel 1950. *Gnomon* 22: 142–43.

Magnani, M. 2015. Chaerem. fr. 1, 1s. Sn.–K. *Paideia* 70: 255–66.

Magnelli, E. 1999. *Alexandri Aetoli testimonia et fragmenta.* Florence.

Maiuri, A. 1925. *Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos*. Florence.

Maltomini, Francesca. 2001. Nove epigrammi ellenistici rivisitati (PPetrie II 49 b). *ZPE* 134: 55–66.

Manuwald, G. 2011. *Roman Republican Theatre: a history*. Cambridge.

Manuwald, G. 2016. Roman tragedy. In B. van Zyl Smit (ed.), *A Handbook to the Reception of Greek Drama* (Malden MA, Oxford): 78–93.

Marini, N. 1992. II P. Oxy 2382 e les 'femmes en noir' di Sofocle, *QUCC* 42.3: 37–44.

Marshall, C. W. 2009. Sophocles' *Chryses* and the date of *Iphigenia in Tauris.* In Cousland and Hume (eds) 2009: 141–56.

Martano, A. 2007. Teodette di Faselide poeta tragico: riflessioni attorno al fr. 6 Snell. In Mirhady (ed.) 2007: 187–99.

Martinelli, M. 2010. Una nuova *Medea* in musica: P. Louvre Inv. E10534 e la *Medea* di Carcino. In M. Celentano (ed.), *Ricerche di metrica e musica Greca per Roberto Pretagostini* (Alessandria): 61–76.

Mastronarde, D. J. 1979. *Contact and Discontinuity. Some conventions of speech and action on the Greek tragic stage.* Berkeley.

Mastronarde, D. J. 1995. Euripides: *Phoenissae*. Cambridge.

Mastronarde, D. J. 2002. Euripides: *Medea*. Cambridge.

Mastronarde, D. J. 2010. *The Art of Euripides*. Cambridge.

Matelli, E. 2007. Teodette di Faselide, retore. In Mirhady (ed.) 2007: 169–85.

Mazzoldi, S. 2001. *Cassandra, la vergine e l'indovina: identità di un personaggio da Omero all'Ellenismo.* Pisa, Rome.

Medda, E. 2018. Cassandra in a shard from post-classical tragedy (TrGF adesp. 649). *Dionysus ex Machina* 9: 53–79.

Meeks, W. A. 1968. Moses as God and King. In J. Neusner (ed.), *Religions in Antiquity. Essays in memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (Leiden): 354–71.

Meineke, A. 1830. *Quaestionum scenicarum specimen tertium*. Berlin.

Meineke, A. 1839. *Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum, I: Historia critica comicorum Graecorum.* Berlin.

Meineke, A. 1855. Ueber der tragischen Dichter Moschion. *Bericht . . . der Königl. Preuss. Akademie etc.,* philosoph.-histor. Klasse, 1855: 102–114.

Melero, A. 2008. Algunas notas a Mosquión (fg. 6 N/S) sobre la idea de progreso. *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* 18: 189–99.

Merkelbach, R. 1977. *Die Quellen des griechischen Alexander-Romans*. Munich.

Methner, R. 1882. *De tragicorum Graecorum minorum et anonymorum fragmentis observationes criticae, II.* Progr. Bromberg.

Millis, B., D. Olson. 2012. *Inscriptional records for the dramatic festivals in Athens:* IG *II² 2318–2325 and related texts*. Leiden.

Mirhady, D. (ed.). 2007. *Influences on Peripatetic Rhetoric. Essays in honor of William W. Fortenbaugh.* Leiden.

Moloney, E. 2003. *Theatre for a New Age: Macedonia and ancient Greek drama.* Diss. Cambridge.

Moloney, E. 2014. Greek tragedy and Macedonia. In H. Roisman (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Greek Tragedy* (Malden MA and Oxford).

Monda, S. 2000. Gli indovinelli di Teodette. *SemRom* 3: 29–48.

Monoson, S. 2012. Dionysius I and Sicilian theatrical traditions in Plato's *Republic*. Representing continuities between democracy and tyranny. In Bosher (ed.) 2012: 156–72.

Montana, F. 2015. Hellenistic scholarship. In Montanari et al. 2015: 60–183.

Montanari, F. 2015. *Ekdosis*. A product of ancient scholarship. In Montanari et al. 2015: 641–72.

Montanari, F., St. Matthiaos, A. Rengakos. 2015. *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship.* Two volumes. Leiden.

Moorhouse, A. C. 1962. ΕΥ ΟΙΔΑ and ΟΥΔΕ ΕΙΣ: cases of hiatus. *CQ* 12: 239–47.

Moorhouse, A. C. 1965. A use of οὐδείς and μηδείς. *CQ* 15: 31–40.

Moorhouse, A. C. 1982. *The Syntax of Sophocles.* Leiden

Morel, W. 1937. Andromacha Aechmalotis. *Philologische Wochenschrift* 57: 558–60.

Morelli, G. 2001. *Teatro attico e pittura vascolare. Una tragedia di Cheremone nella ceramica italiota.* Hildesheim.

Morelli, G. 2003. Per la ricostruzione del *Centauro* di Cheremone. In A. Martina (ed.), *Teatro Greco Postclassico e Teatro Latino. Teorie e Prassi Drammatica* (Rome): 11–27.

Moro, C. 2011. Mosè erede al trono d'Egitto nelle fonti giudeo-ellenistiche. *Aegyptus* 91: 239–51.

Mras, K. 1944. Ein Vorwort zur neuen Eusebiusausgabe. *RhM* 92: 217–36.

Mras, K. 1954–56. *Eusebius, Werke, VIII: Die Praeparatio Evangelica.* Two volumes. Berlin.

Muccioli, F. 1999. *Dionisio II: Storia e Tradizione Letteraria*. Bologna.

Mueller-Goldingen, Chr. 2005 *Studien zum antiken Drama.* Hildesheim.

Müller, C. W. 1985. Die Zahl der Siegen des älteren and des jüngeren Sophokles. *RhM* 128: 93–95.

Müller, C. W. 1986. Io und Argos auf einem frühkaiserzeitlichen Wandmosaik. *RhM* 129: 142–56.

Müller, K. O. 1840. *History of the Literature of Ancient Greece.* Translated by G. C. Lewis and J. W. Donaldson. Two volumes. London.

Munro, J. 1901. Notes on the text of the Parian Marble. *Classical Review* 15: 149–54, 355–61.

Nauck, A. 1848. *Aristophanis Byzantii grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta.* Halle.

Nauck, A. 1889. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.* Second edition. Leipzig.

Nervegna, S. 2013. *Menander in Antiquity. The Contexts of Reception*. Cambridge.

Nervegna, S. 2019. Sositheus and his 'new' satyr-play. *CQ* 69: 202–13.

Nicolini, F. 1935–36. Un poeta dell'antica Siracusa: Sosifane. *Dioniso* 5: 9–21.

Niebuhr, B. G. 1827. Ueber das Zeitalter Lycophrons des Dunkeln. *RhM* 1: 108–17 (= *Kleine Schriften* I*,* Bonn, 1828: 438–50).

Niehoff, M. 1996. The Phoenix in Rabbinic Literature. *Harvard Theological Review* 89: 245–65.

Noussia, M. 2006. Fragments of Cynic tragedy. In M. A. Harder et al. (eds), *Beyond the Canon* (Leuven): 229–47.

Obbink, D. 1996. *Philodemus. On Piety. Part 1*. Oxford.

Oegema, G. 2002. *Einführung zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit: Poetische Schriften* (*JSHRZ* VI, Supp. 1). Gütersloh.

Olivieri, A. 1950. Dioniso 1º tiranno di Siracusa e Patrocle di Turi, poeti drammatici. *Dioniso* 13: 91–102.

Önal, M. 2008. Die Mosaiken im Triklinium des 'Kointos Hauses' in Zeugma. In E. Winter (ed.), *Patris Pantrophos Kommagene: neue Funde und Forschungen zwischen Taurus und Euphrat* (Bonn: *Asia Minor Studien* 60): 262–73.

Orlov, A. 2008. In the mirror of the divine face: the Enochic features of the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian. In G. J. Brooke et al. (eds), *The Significance of Sinai. Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity* (Leiden): 183–99.

O'Sullivan, P., C. Collard. 2013. *Euripides,* Cyclops *and major fragments of Greek satyric drama*. Oxford.

Pacelli, V. 2016. *Teodette di Faselide: Frammenti Poetici.* Tübingen.

Packmohr, A. 1913. *De Diogenis Sinopensis apopthegmatis quaestiones selectae.* Diss. Münster.

Padgett, J. et al. 1993. *Vase-painting in Italy. Red-figure and related works in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.* Boston.

Page, D. L. 1941. *Select Papyri, III: Literary Papyri, Poetry.* Cambridge MA, London.

Page, D. L. 1951a. *A New Chapter in the History of Greek Tragedy.* Inaugural lecture. Cambridge.

Page, D. L. 1951b. *Alcman: the Partheneion.* Oxford.

Page, D. L. 1962. An early tragedy on the fall of Croesus? *PCPhS* n.s. 8: 47–49.

Page, D. L. 1981. *Further Greek Epigrams.* Cambridge.

Palmisciano, R. 2004. Review of Morelli 2001. *Aion* 26: 233–41.

Papastamati-von Moock, Chr. 2014. The Theatre of Dionysus Eleuthereus in Athens. New data and observations on its 'Lycurgan' phase. In Csapo et al. 2014, 15–76.

Papathomopoulos, M. 1981. Tzetzès sur les Ἕκτορος λύτρα de Denys le Tyran. *Revue des Études Grecques* 94: 200–5.

Parker, R. 1996. *Athenian Religion: a History*. Oxford.

Paton, J. M. 1901. The *Antigone* of Euripides. *HSCPh* 12: 267–76.

Pearson, A. C. 1917. *The Fragments of Sophocles.* Three volumes. Cambridge.

Pearson, L. 1955. The Diary and the Letters of Alexander the Great. *Historia* 3: 429–55.

Pellé, N. 2015. Una nuova edizione di PTebt II 268. *Studi di Egittologia e di Papiriologia* 12: 63–79.

Pfeiffer, R. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship: From the beginnings to the end of the Hellenistic age*. Oxford.

Philippson, R. 1920. Zu Philodems Schrift uber die Frömmigkeit. *Hermes* 55: 225–78.

Piatkowski, A. 1981. La déscription de la figure humaine dans le drame Grec du IV-eme siecle av.n.ère. *Philologus* 125: 201–10.

Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. 1933. Tragedy. In J. U. Powell (ed.), *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature: Third Series* (Oxford): 68–155.

Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. 1988. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. Second edition revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis (1968), with supplement and corrections. Oxford.

Pilling, K. 1886. *Quomodo Telephi fabulam et scriptores et artifices veteres tractaverint*. Diss. Halle.

Pohlenz, M. 1954. *Die griechische Tragödie.* Two volumes. Second edition. Göttingen.

Pöhlmann, E. 1977. Der Überlieferungswert der χορεῦ-Vermerke in Papyri und Handschriften. *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* n.f. 3: 69–81.

Pöhlmann, E., M. L. West. 2001. *Documents of Ancient Greek Music.* Oxford.

Potter, D. 2021. Review of Rozokoki 2019. *CR* 71.2, forthcoming.

Powell, J. U. 1925. *Collectanea Alexandrina.* Oxford.

Pretagostini, R., E. Dettori (eds). 2007. *La cultura letteraria ellenistica: persistenza, innovazione, trasmissione*. Rome.

Primavesi, O. 2003. Farbige Plastik in der antiken Literatur? Vorschläge für eine differenzierte Lesung. In V. Brinkmann, R. Wünsche (eds), *Bunte Götter. Die Farbigkeit antiker Skulptur* (Munich): 219–237.

Probert, P. 2003. *A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek.* London.

Quijado Sagredo, M., M. C. Encinas Reguero (eds). 2017. *Connecting Rhetoric and Drama.* Bari.

Radermacher, L. 1902. Aus dem zweiten Bande der Amherst Papyri. *RhM* 57: 137–51.

Radermacher, L. 1903. Euripides als litterarischer Kritker. *RhM* 58: 546–61.

Radermacher, L. 1939. Θεοδέκται. *Anzeiger der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Wien*, phil.-hist. Klasse, 76: 62–69.

Radermacher, L. 1951. *Artium scriptores. Reste der voraristotelischen Rhetorik.* Vienna.

Raubitschek, A. 1955. Gyges in Herodotus. *Classical Weekly* 48: 48–50.

Ravenna, O. 1903. Di Moschione e di Teodette poeti tragici. *Rivista di Storia Antica* 7: 736–804.

Reitzenstein, R. 1893. *Epigramm und Skolion.* Giessen.

Revermann, M., P. Wilson (eds). 2008. *Performance, Iconography, Reception. Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin.* Oxford.

Ribbeck, O. 1875. *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik*. Leipzig.

Ribbeck, O. 1897. *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta, I. Tragicorum Fragmenta.* Third edition. Leipzig.

Richardson, N. J. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter.* Oxford.

Richter, G. M. A. 1965. *The Portraits of the Greeks.* Three volumes. London.

Risch, E. 1949. Griechische Determinativkomposita. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 59: 245–94.

Ritschl, F. 1866. *Opuscula Philologica* I. Leipzig.

Robert, C. 1876. Iphigenia in Tauris. *Archäologische Zeitung* 33: 133–48.

Robert, C. 1887, 1888. Beiträge zur Erklärung des pergamenischen Telephosfrieze. *JDAI* 2: 244–59 and 3: 45–65.

Robert, C. 1915. *Oidipus: Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffes in griechishcen Altertum.* Berlin.

Robert, C. 1919. *Archaeologische Hermeneutik. Anleitung zur Deutung klassischer Bildwerke.* Berlin.

Robert, C. 1921. *Die griechische Heldensage.* Three volumes. Berlin.

Robertson, M. 1990. Troilos and Polyxene. Notes on a changing legend. In J.-P. Descœudres (ed.), *EYMOYΣIA: Ceramic and Iconographic Studies in Honour of Alexander Cambitoglou* (Sydney): 63–70.

Robertson, R. G. 1985. Ezekiel the Tragedian. A new translation and introduction. In Charlesworth (ed.) 1985: 803–19.

Roeper, G. 1848. Conjecturen zu Diogenes Laertius. *Philologus* 3: 22–65.

Rohde, E. 1878–79. *Γέγονε* in den Biographica des Suidas. *RhM* 33: 161–220, 638 and 34: 620–22 (= *Kleine Schriften* I, 1901: 114–84).

Rohde, E. 1879. Philo von Byblus und Hesychius von Milet. *RhM* 34: 561–74 (= *Kleine Schriften* I, 1901: 365–79).

Rose, H. J. 1933. *Hygini Fabulae*. Leiden.

Rotstein, A. 2016. *Literary History in the Parian Marble*. Washington DC.

Roux, G. 1967. Sur deux textes relatifs à Adonis. *Revue de Philologie* 41: 259–64.

Rozokoki, A. 2019. Η αρνητική παρουσίαση των Ελλήνων στην *Αλεξάνδρα* του Λυκόφρονα και η χρονολόγηση του ποιήματος. The negative presentation of the Greeks in Lycophron's Alexandra and the dating of the poem. Athens.

Ruffatto, K. 2006. Polemics with Enochic Traditions in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 15: 195–210.

Ruffatto, K. 2008. Raguel as interpreter of Moses' throne vision. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 17: 121–39.

Ruiten, J. van. 2006. A Burning Bush on the Stage: The rewriting of *Exodus* 3. In G. van Kooten (ed.), *The Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses: Perspectives from Judaism etc.* (Leiden): 71–88.

Russo, G. 2008. Due note a frammenti di tragici greci. *RFIC* 136: 129–36.

Rutherford, I. *Theoria* and theatre at Samothrace: the *Dardanus* by Dymas of Iasos. In Wilson (ed.) 2007: 279–93.

Sanders, L. J. 1987. *Dionysius I of Syracuse and Greek Tyranny*. London.

Sansone, D. 1984, Ad Ezek. Trag. *Exag.* (*TrGF* 128) 207–8. *Mnemosyne* 37: 442–43.

Scafoglio, G. 2006. *L'*Astyanax *di Accio*. Brussels.

Scheer, T. 1993. *Mythische Vorväter: zur Bedeutung griechischer Heroenmythen im Selbstverständnis kleinasiatischer Städte*. Munich.

Schefold, K. 1997. *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker*. Second edition. Basel.

Schefold, K., F. Jung 1989 *Die Sagen von den Argonauten, von Theben und Troia in der klassichsen und hellenistischen Kunst.* Munich.

Schenkl, K. 1888. Die Astragalistai des Alexandros Aitolos. *Wiener Studien* 10: 326–27.

Schierl, P. 2006. *Die Tragödien des Pacuvius.* Berlin.

Schironi, F. 2018. *The Best of the Grammarians: Aristarchus of Samothrace on the* Iliad*.* Ann Arbor.

Schmidt, V. 1968. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Herondas*. Berlin.

Schneidewin, F. W. 1848. Variae lectiones. *Philologus* 3: 106–32.

Schober, A. 1923. *Philodemi περὶ εὐσεβείας libelli partem priorem restituit*. Diss. Königsberg, published as Philodemi de Pietate Pars Prior, *Cronache Ercolanesi* 18 (1988): 67–125.

Schorn, S. 2004. *Satyros aus Kallatis, Sammlung der Fragmente etc*. Basel.

Schramm, F. 1929. *Tragicorum graecorum hellenisticae quae dicitur aetatis fragmenta.* Diss. Münster.

Schubert, Chr. 2013. Ein literarisches Akrostichon aus der ersten Hälfte des vierten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.? *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 16: 389–97.

Schwarz, G. 2001. Der Tod und das Mädchen: frühe Polyxena-Bilder. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 116: 35–50.

Schwarz, G. 2008. Eine rätselhafte Frau: zur Ikonographie von 'Hektors Lösung' auf attischen Sarkophagen. In Chr. Franek (ed.), *Thiasos: Festschrift für Erwin Pochmarski zum 65. Geburtstag* (Vienna): 911–19.

Schwyzer, E. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik, II. Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. Completed and edited by A. Debrunner. Munich.

Scodel, R. 2007. Lycurgus and the state text of tragedy. In C. Cooper (ed.), *Politics of Orality* (Leiden): 129–54.

Scopece, L. 1994. Sosith. fr. 1 Sn.–K. *Sileno* 20: 413–17.

Séchan, L. 1926. *Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique*. Paris.

Seidensticker, A. 1995. Dichtung und Gesellschaft im 4. Jahrhundert: Versuch eines Überblickes. In W. Eder (ed.), *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. etc.* (Stuttgart): 175–98.

Sens, A. 2010. Hellenistic Tragedy and Lycophron's *Alexandra*. In Clauss–Cuypers 2010: 297–313.

Sens, A. 2020. *Hellenistic Epigrams: a Selection.* Cambridge.

Sifakis, G. M. 1967. *Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama*. London.

Silk, M. 1983. LSJ and the problem of poetic archaism. From meaning to iconyms. *CQ* 33: 303–30.

Simon, E. 1982. Dramen des älteren Dionysios auf italiotischen Vasen. In L. Beschi et al. (eds) , *ΑΠΑΡΧΑΙ: Nuove ricerche . . . in onore di Paolo Enrico Arias* (Pisa): 479–82.

Sims, T. 2020. Some thoughts on Theodectas' *Mausolus*. *CQ* 70: 131–36.

Siron, N. 2018. Review of Quijado Sagredo–Encinas Reguero 2017. *BMCR* 2018.11.25.

Slater, W. J. 2001. Gnomology and criticism. *GRBS* 41: 99–121.

Slater, W. J. 2010. Paying the Pipers. In B. Le Guen (ed.), *L'Argent dans les concours du monde grec* (Saint-Denis): 249–81.

Slater, W. J., M. J. Cropp. 2009. Leukippe as tragedy. *Philologus* 153: 63–85.

Sluiter, I. 2005. Communicating Cynicism: Diogenes' gangsta rap. In D. Frede, B. Inwood (eds), *Language and Learning: Philosophy of Language in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge): 139–63.

Smyth, H. W. 1920. *Greek Grammar.* Cambridge MA.

Snell. B. 1937. Euripides Alexandros und andere Strassburger Papyri mit Fragmenten griechischer Dichter. *Hermes* Einzelschriften 5. Berlin.

Snell, B. 1966. Die Jamben in Ezechiels Moses-Drama. *Glotta* 44: 25–32.

Snell, B. 1971. *Szenen aus Griechischen Dramen.* Berlin.

Snell, B. 1973. Gyges und Kroisos als Tragödien-Figuren. *ZPE* 12: 197–205.

Snell, B. 1980. Epigramm an einen Nahe-Stehenden (Anth. Pal. 6,119). *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* n.f. 6a: 17–18.

Snowden, F. 1970. *Blacks in Antiquity: Ethiopians in the Greco-Roman Experience.* Cambridge MA.

Sommerstein, A. 2002. The titles of Greek dramas. *SemRom* 5: 1–16. Reprinted with addenda in Sommerstein 2010b: 11–29.

Sommerstein, A. 2008. *Aeschylus. Fragments.* Cambridge MA, London.

Sommerstein, A. 2010a. Sophocles' Palamedes and Nauplius Plays. In Sommerstein 2010b: 250–58.

Sommerstein, A. 2010b. *The Tangled Ways of Zeus and other studies in and around Greek Tragedy.* Oxford.

Sommerstein, A. (ed.). 1993. *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis*. Bari.

Sommerstein, A. 2012. Fragments and lost tragedies. In A. Markantonatos (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Sophocles* (Leiden): 191–209.

Sommerstein, A., D. Fitzpatrick, T. Talboy. 2006. *Sophocles: Selected Fragmentary Plays, Volume 1*. Oxford.

Spaltenstein, F. 2014. *Commentaire des fragments dramatiques de Naevius*. Brussels.

Steffen, V. 1939. De poetis tragicis Pleaidi Alexandrinae tribuendis. In Steffen, *Quaestionum tragicarum capita tria* (Poznań, 1939): 17–24.

Steffen, V. 1979. *De Graecorum Fabulis Satyricis.* Wrocław.

Stenico, A. 1966. I figli di Agamemnone a Sminthe. Toreutica e ceramica arretina. In *Arte in Europa. Scritti di storia dell'arte in onore di Edoardo Arslan* (Milan): I.29–46.

Stephanopoulos, Th. 1984. Review of Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980. *Hellenika* 35: 176–93.

Stephanopoulos, Th. 1988. Tragica II. *ZPE* 75: 3–38.

Stephanopoulos, Th. 1989. Varia graeca. *RhM* 132: 294–97.

Stephanopoulos, Th. 1995–96. Der Tragiker Moschion. 1: Kommentar zu den Fragmenten 1, 3, 4. *Archaiognosia* 9: 137–53.

Stephanopoulos, Th. 1999–2000. Der Tragiker Moschion (Zweiter Teil): Kommentar zu den Fragmenten 5, 7, 8. *Archaiognosia* 10:51–63.

Stephanopoulos, Th. 2013. Marginalia tragica I. *Logeion* 3: 66–70.

Stephanopoulos, Th. 2014. Marginalia tragica II. *Logeion* 4: 193–200.

Stewart, A. 1996. A hero's quest: narrative and the Telephus Frieze. In Dreyfus–Schraudolph 1996–97: I.39–52.

Stewart, E. 2018. Ezekiel's *Exagoge*: A Typical Hellenistic Tragedy? *GRBS* 58: 223–52.

Stieber, M. 2011. *Euripides and the Language of Craft.* Leiden.

Stoessl, F. 1970. Nikomachos 13–14 (Supplements). *RE* Suppl. XII: 895–97.

Stroheker, K. F. 1958. *Dionysios I. Gestalt und Geschichte des Tyrannen von Syrakus*. Wiesbaden.

Strootman, R. 2010. Literature and the Kings. In Clauss–Cuypers 2010: 30–45.

Strootman, R. 2017. *The Birdcage of the Muses. Patronage of the Arts and Sciences at the Ptolemaic Imperial Court, 305–222 BCE*. Leuven.

Strugnell, J. 1967. Notes on the text and metre of Ezekiel the tragedian's *Exagôgê*. *Harvard Theological Review* 60: 449–57.

Suess, W. 1966. Der ältere Dionys als Tragiker. *RhM* 109: 299–318.

Sutton, D. F. 1987. Ezechieliana. *RhM* 130: 34–39.

Swift, L. A. 2014. Telephus on Paros: genealogy and myth in the 'new Archilochus' poem (*P. Oxy*. 4708). *CQ* 64: 433–47.

Swift, L. A. 2019. *Archilochus. The Poems*. Oxford.

Taplin, O. 1977a. Did Greek Dramatists Write Stage Instructions? *PCPhS* n.s. 23: 121–32.

Taplin, O. 1977b. *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus*. Oxford.

Taplin, O. 2007. *Pots and Plays. Interactions between tragedy and Greek vase-painting of the fourth century B.C.* Malibu.

Taplin, O. 2009. Hector's helmet glinting in a fourth-century tragedy. In S. Goldhill, E. Hall, *Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition* (Cambridge): 251–63.

Taplin, O. 2014. How pots and papyri might prompt a re-evaluation of fourth-century tragedy. In Csapo et al. 2014: 141–55.

Taplin, O. 2019. The spread of Greek theatre to the West – and to the North-East? In Braund et al. 2019, 14–25.

Tarán, L. 2016. The text of Aristotle's *Poetics* in the codex Parisinus graecus 2038. *Mnemosyne* 69: 785–98.

Tarán, L., D. Gutas. 2012. *Aristotle:* Poetics. Leiden.

Tarrant, R. J. 1978. Senecan drama and its antecedents. *HSCPh* 82: 213–63.

Tarrant, R. J. 1985. *Seneca's* Thyestes. Atlanta.

ten Brink, B. 1851. Hipponactea. *Philologus* 6: 35–80, 215–27.

Thissen, H. J. Zum Namen 'Moses'. *RhM* 147: 55–62.

Thraemer, E. 1888. *Pergamos. Untersuchungen über die Frühgeschichte Kleinasiens und Griechenlands.* Leipzig.

Todisco, L. 2003. *La ceramica figurata a soggetto tragico in Magna Grecia e in Sicilia*. Rome.

Tosi, R. 1991. Proverbi antichi in tradizioni moderne. *Eikasmos* 2: 227–47.

Tosi, R. 1995. Note ai frammenti tragici attribuiti a Diogene Cinico. In L. Belloni et al. (eds), *Studia Classica Johanni Tarditi Oblata* (Milan): II.939–46.

Tosi, R. 2017. *Dizionario delle sentenze latine e greche.* Second edition. Milan.

Trencsényi-Waldapfel, I. 1952. Une tragédie grecque à sujet biblique. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 2: 143–64.

Trendall, A. D. 1984. Medea at Eleusis on a Volute Krater by the Darius Painter. *Record of the Art Museum, Princeton University* 43.1: 4–17.

Trendall, A. D., A. Cambitoglou. 1978. *The Red-Figured Vases of Apulia*. Three volumes. Oxford.

Trendall, A. D., T. B. L. Webster. 1971. *Illustrations of Greek Drama*. London.

Tsantsanoglou, K. 2006. The scholia on Alcman's *Partheneion*. *Hellenika* 56: 17–30.

Tueller, M. 2008. *Look Who's Talking. Voice and identity in Hellenistic epigram*. Leuven.

Tuna-Nörling, Y. 2001. Polyxena bei Hektors Lösung. Zu einem attisch-rotfiguren Krater aus Tekirdağ (Bisanthe/Rhaidestos). *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 2001: 27–44.

Usher, M. D. 2009. Diogenes' Doggerel: Chreia and Quotation in Cynic Performance. *Classical Journal* 104: 207–23.

Vahlen, J. 1899. Bemerkungen zu Ennius. *SBAW* 1899, 266–79 (= *Gesammelte Philologische Schriften* II, Leipzig and Berlin, 1923: 521–36).

Vahtikari, V. 2014 *Tragedy performances outside Athens in the late fifth and the fourth centuries BC.* Helsinki.

Valckenaer, L. C. 1767. *Diatribe in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias*. Leiden.

van den Broek, R. 1972. *The Myth of the Phoenix According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions*. Leiden.

van der Horst, P. W. 1983. Moses' throne vision in Ezekiel the dramatist. *Journal of Jewish Studies* 34: 21–29.

van der Horst, P. W. 1984. Some notes on the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel. *Mnemosyne* 37: 352–75.

Ventrella, G. 2011. L'Edipo di Diogene e l'utopia cinica nel teatro greco: a proposito di Dione Crisostomo, *or*. X 29–32. *L'Antiquité Classique* 80: 53–71.

Veyne, P. 1989. ΔΙΑΣΚΕΥΑΙ: le theâtre grec sous l'Empire (Dion de Pruse, XXXII. 94). *Revue des Études Grecques* 102: 339–45.

Vinagre, M. A. 2003. En torno a la datación del tragediógrafo Mosquión y al concepto griego del progreso humano. *Emerita* 71: 115–43.

Vogt, E. 1983. Tragiker Ezechiel. In E. Vogt, N. Walter, *Tragiker Ezechiel etc*. (*JSHRZ* IV.3, Gütersloh, 1983): 115–33.

Vogt, E. 1994. Das Moses-Drama des Ezechiel und die attische Tragödie. In A. Bierl, P. von Möllendorff (eds), *Orchestra: Drama, Mythos, Bühne. Festschrift für Helmut Flashar* (Stuttgart): 151–60.

Vollkommer. R. 1988. *Herakles in the Art of Classical Greece.* Oxford.

von Blumenthal, A. 1942. Sophokles. Bericht über das Schrifttum der Jahre 1936–1938. *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der Altertumswissenschaft* 277: 1–72.

von Fritz, K. 1926. *Quellenuntersuchungen zu Leben und Philosophie des Diogenes von Sinope. Philologus* Suppl. 18.2. Leipzig.

von Fritz, K. 1949. Pasiphon (2). *RE* 18.2: 2084.

Wagner, F. W. 1846. *De Moschionis poetae tragici vita etc.* Breslau.

Walker, R. J. 1923. *Addenda Scenica*. Paris.

Walter, N. 1990. Jewish–Greek literature of the Greek period. In W. Davies, L. Finkelstein (eds), *The Cambridge History of Judaism, II: The Hellenistic Age*: 385–408.

Watson, G. 1988. Phantasia in Classical Thought. Galway

Weber, E. 1887. De Dione Chrysostomo Cynicorum Sectatore. *Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie* 10: 77–268.

Webster, T. B. L. 1954. Fourth century tragedy and the *Poetics*. *Hermes* 82: 294–308.

Webster, T. B. L. 1963. Alexandrian epigrams and the theatre. In *Miscellanea di studi Alessandrini in memoria di A. Rostagni* (Turin): 531–43.

Webster, T. B. L. 1967. *Monuments Illustrating Tragedy and Satyr-play*. Second edition. London.

Webster, T. B. L. 1972. Review of *TrGF* I. *Gnomon* 44: 737–40.

Wecklein, N. 1891. Dramatisches und Kritisches zu den Fragmenten der griechischen Tragiker. *Sitzungsberichte . . . München* 1890.1: 1–57.

Weil, H. 1901. Nouveaux papyrus littéraires. *Journal des Savants*, 1901: 737–41.

Welcker, F. G. 1839a, 1839b. 1841. *Die Griechischen Tragödien, mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus.* Three volumes. Bonn

West, M. L. 1975. *Immortal Helen.* Inaugural lecture. London (= 2011: 80–96).

West, M. L. 1979. The Prometheus trilogy. *JHS* 99: 130–48 (= 2013a: 250–86 with postscript).

West, M. L. 1982. *Greek Metre*. Oxford.

West, M. L. 1983a. Tragica VI. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 30: 63–82.

West, M. L. 1983b. *The Orphic Poems.* Oxford.

West, M. L. 1985. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure and Origins.* Oxford.

West, M. L. 1999. Sophocles with Music? Ptolemaic music fragments and remains of Sophocles (Junior?), *Achilleus*. *ZPE* 126: 43–65.

West, M. L. 2007. A new musical papyrus: Carcinus, *Medea*, *ZPE* 161: 1–10. Revised in West 2013a: 334–50.

West, M. L. 2011. *Hellenica, I: Epic.* Oxford.

West, M. L. 2013a. *Hellenica, II: Lyric and Drama.* Oxford.

West, M. L. 2013b. *The Epic Cycle: a commentary on the lost Troy epics*. Oxford.

Wevers, J. W. 1990. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus.* Atlanta.

Wevers, J. W. 1990. *Text History of the Greek Exodus*. Göttingen.

Whitmarsh, T. 2010. Prose fiction. In Clauss–Cuypers 2010: 395–411.

Whitmarsh, T. 2013. Politics and Identity in Ezekiel's *Exagoge*. In Whitmarsh, *Beyond the Second Sophistic: adventures in Greek postclassicism* (Berkeley): 211–27.

Wieneke, J. 1931. *Ezechielis Iudaei poetae Alexandrini fabulae quae inscribitur Ἐξαγωγή fragmenta*. Münster.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1875. *Analecta Euripidea.* Berlin,

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1881. *Antigonos von Karystos*. Berlin.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1883. Die beiden Elektren. *Hermes* 18: 214–63 (= 1972: 161–208).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1893. *De tragicorum graecorum fragmentis commentatio*. Index scholarum etc., Göttingen (= 1935: 176–208).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1895. *Euripides: Herakles.* Three volumes. Second edition. Berlin.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1912. Neues von Kallimachos. *Sitzungsberichte . . . Berlin* 1912: 524–50.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1919. Lesefrüchte 152–170. *Hermes* 54: 46–74 (= 1962: 284–313).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1924 *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. Two volumes. Berlin.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1925. Lesefrüchte 193–202. *Hermes* 60: 280–316 (= 1962: 368–403).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1926. Lesefrüchte 203–217. *Hermes* 61: 277–303 (= 1962: 404–30).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1929. Lesefrüchte 249–266. *Hermes* 64: 458–90 (= 1962: 476–508).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1930. Lesefrüchte 267–280. *Hermes* 65: 241–58 (= 1962: 509–27).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1935, 1962, 1972. *Kleine Schriften* I, IV, VI. Berlin.

Wilkins, J. 1993. *Euripides:* Heraclidae. Oxford.

Williamson, C. G. 2016. Mountain, myth and territory: Teuthrania as focal point in the landscape of Pergamon. In J. McInerney, I. Sluiter (eds), *Valuing Landscape in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden): 70–99.

Wilson, P. J. 1996. Tragic rhetoric: the use of tragedy and the tragic in the fourth century. In M. Silk (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic* (Oxford): 310–31.

Wilson, P. J. 2007. Sicilian choruses. In Wilson (ed.) 2007: 351–77.

Wilson, P. J. (ed.). 2007. *The Greek Theatre and Festivals: documentary studies* (Oxford).

Wright, M. 2016a. *The Lost Plays of Greek Tragedy, I: Neglected Authors.* New York, London.

Wright, M. 2016b. Euripidean tragedy and quotation culture: the case of *Sthenoboea* F 661. *AJPh* 137: 601–23.

Wright. M. 2020. Making Medea Medea. In P. Finglass, L. Coo (eds), *Female Characters in Fragmentary Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge): 216–43.

Xanthaki-Karamanou, G. 1986. Οἱ Φεραῖοι τοῦ Μοσχίωνα, ἕνα μετακλασσικὸ ἱστορικὸ δράμα. *Hypereia* 1: 93–100 (= 2002: 229ff.).

Xanthaki-Karamanou, G. 1990. Τὸ Αἰγαῖο στὸ ἔργο τοῦ ῥήτορα καὶ τραγικοῦ Θεοδέκτη: ὁ Μαύσωλος. *Parnassos* 32:12–23 (= 2002: 215ff.).

Xanthaki-Karamanou, G. 2017. Dramatic debates in post-classical tragedy: additional remarks. In M. Quijada Sagredo, M. del Carmen Encinas Reguero (eds), *Connecting Rhetoric and Attic Drama* (Bari): 213–40.

Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. 1980. *Studies in Fourth-Century Tragedy.* Athens.

Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. 1981a. Remarks on Moschion's account of progress. *CQ* 31: 410–17 (= 2002: 129ff.).

Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. 1981b. The *Hector* of Astydamas: reconstruction and motifs. *Museum Philologum Londiniense* 4: 213–223 (= 2002: 115–28).

Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. 1982–83. ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς Θερσιτοκτόνος τοῦ Χαιρήμονος. *Platon* 34–35: 55–67 (= 2002: 165ff.).

Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. 1988. Additional remarks on the possible attribution of some papyrus-fragments to post-classical tragedies. In *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens, 25–31 May 1986* (Athens): I.403–17.

Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. 1997. A survey of the main papyrus texts of post-classical tragedy. In B. Kramer (ed.), *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses: Berlin, 13–19.8.1995* (Stuttgart): 1034–48 (= 2002: 387–401).

Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. 2001. The *Exagoge* of Ezekiel and fifth-century tragedy: similarities of theme and concept. In B. Zimmermann (ed.), *Rezeption des antiken Dramas auf der Bühne und in der Literatur* (Stuttgart): 223–39.

Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. 2002. *Dramatica*. *Studies in classical and postclassical dramatic poetry*. Athens.

Zimmermann, Chr. 1993. *Der Antigone-Mythos in der antike Literatur und Kunst.* Munich.

Zouganeli, A. 2013. La fonction des acrostiches de Chairémon et de Denys le Transfuge: poètes ἀναγνωστικοί. *Camenulae* 10: 1–9.

Zouganeli, A. 2017. Ο μύθος ως μεθοδολογικό εργαλείο στη μελέτη των τραγικών αποσπασμάτων του 4ου αιώνα π.Χ. In M. Tamiloaki (ed.), Μεθοδολογικά ζητήματα στις Κλασικές Σπουδές: παλαιά προβλήματα και νέες προκλήσεις (Iraklio): 71–88.

Zuretti, C. O. 1897. L'attività letteraria dei due Dionisii di Siracusa. *RFIC* 25: 529–57.

Zwierlein, O. 1966. *Die Rezitationsdramen Senecas.* Meisenheim-an-Glan.

INDEXES

(a) ***Tragic poets*** *(others less known or doubtfully identified are listed on pages viii–ix, notes 4–6)*

Achaeus I (*TrGF* 20) 105, 148

Achaeus II (*TrGF* 79) xn., xin.

Aeanti(a)des (*TrGF* 102) 270f., **274f.**, 291

Aeschylus I (*TrGF* 5) 23, 27, 37, 49, 189, 197, 285; *Agamemnon* 373; *Arms Judgment* 64; *Bone-gatherers* 106; *Circe*^{s} 106*, Danaids* 106*,* 140; *Eleusinians* 259f.; *Eumenides* 314; *Ghost-raisers* 106; *Heralds* 105; *Myrmidons* 49f., 68; *Mysians* 395; *Palamedes* 42; *Penelope* 106; *Pentheus/Bacchae* 102; *Persians* 244f., 361; *Philoctetes* 148f.; *Ransoming of Hector/Phrygians* 35n., 101, 180, 205n., 257; *Sphinx*^{s} 217; *Suppliant Women* 140; *Telephus* 246; *Thracian Women* 64, 136; *Weighing of Souls* 178; *Women of Salamis* 65

Agathon (*TrGF* 39) 29, 163, 395

Alexander of Aetolia (*TrGF* 101) xi, 240, 270–73, 279, 291, 293, **296–99**

Antiphon (*TrGF* 55) ix, ixn., xn., xi, xiin., xiv, **11–19**, 92, 369

Aphareus (*TrGF* 73) xiiin., 91n., **169–71**

Apollodorus of Tarsus (*TrGF* 209) ixn., xin., 107

Aristarchus (*TrGF* 14) 49, 68f., 101n., 121, 238

Astydamas I (*TrGF* 59) 23

Astydamas II (*TrGF* 60) ixn., x–xiv *passim*, xvi, xviii, **24–53**, 91n., 92, 130, 143, 169, 233, 286n., 369, 375n.

Carcinus I (*TrGF* 21) 60

Carcinus II (*TrGF* 70) ix–xv *passim*, xviin., 37, **60–90**, **92,** 148n.

Carcinus of Acragas (*TrGF* 235) 63, 83

Chaeremon (*TrGF* 71) ixn., x, xi, xii, 86, **91–129**, 321n.

Cleaenetus (*TrGF* 84) ixn., 63, 84, **200–2**

Cleophon (*TrGF* 77): viiin., 69, 406n.

Crates of Thebes (*TrGF* 90) 204f., 207, 209, 223, 224, 228, **230f.**

Critias (*TrGF* 43) xi, 261

Dicaeogenes (*TrGF* 52) ix, xiin., xiv, xvi, **3–10**

Diogenes of Athens (*TrGF* 45) 205, 209, 224

Diogenes of Sinope (*TrGF* 88) viiin., xn., x, **203–31**

Dionysi(a)des (*TrGF* 105) 270f., **274**

Dionysius I of Syracuse (*TrGF* 76) x, xi, xii, xiv, xviii, 11, 13, 60, 63, **172–99**

Dymas of Iasos xiiin.

Empedocles of Acragas (*TrGF* 50) ixn., xin.

Euaretus (*TrGF* 85) 29, 69, 101n., 169

Euphronius (*TrGF* 106) 270, 217n., 272, **275**

Euripides III (*TrGF* 18) 241, 242, 307n., 319, 320, 369, 381; *Aeolus* 289; *Alcestis* 175; *Alcmene* 175, 178; *Alcmeon in Corinth* 29n.; *Alcmeon in Psophis* 29n. 139; *Alexander* 408; *Andromache* vii, 15, 405; *Antigone* 32; *Archelaus* 143, 145, 396; *Bacchae* 102, 123; *Chrysippus* 402n.; *Cresphontes* 395, 408; *Electra* 405; *Hecuba* 369; *Helen* 141, 175, 409; *Heracles* 208, 210; *Hippolytus* 165, 193, 410; *Hypsipyle* 101; *Ion* 395; *Iphigenia in Tauris* 369, 396, 399f., 402, 405, 409; *Medea* 6, 71n., 161; *Meleager* 17; *Oedipus* 147; *Oeneus* 108; *Orestes* 175, 202; *Peleus* 165; *Peliades* 214; *Philoctetes* 148f.; *Phoenissae* 239, 374; *Phoenix* 165, 237, 240; *Pleisthenes* 295; *Stheneboea* 165, 314n.; *Suppliant Women* 249; *Telephus* 246f., 256–60, 267; *Theseus* 163; *Trojan Women* 140, 381

Ezechiel (*TrGF* 128) ixn., xi, xvii, 118, 266, **310–68**

Heraclides Ponticus viiin., 27, 48
Homer of Byzantium (*TrGF* 98) 270–74, **276–80**, 281, 283, 291

Ion of Chios (*TrGF* 19) 9, 389n., 393
Iophon (*TrGF* 22) 101n., 381n., 406n.

Lycophron of Chalcis (*TrGF* 100) xiiin., xvii, 43, 211n., 242, 243f., 270–74, 286n., **288–95**, 306n., 375n., 389n., 406n.

Moschion (*TrGF* 97) ixn., xiiinn., xvi, 230, **241–69**, 291, 320f.

Nicolaus of Damascus (*TrGF* 172) ixn., 309n., 385
Nicomachus (4th C.)? viiin., 307
Nicomachus of Alexandria Troas (*TrGF* 127) 29, **306–9**, 381n., 395, 398
Nicomachus of Athens (*TrGF* 36) 306
Nicostratus(?) (*TrGF* 252) viiin., 239
Oenomaus of Gadara (*TrGF* 188) 207, 209, 224

[Patrocles of Athens] (*TrGF* 57) viiin., 20
Patrocles of Thurii (*TrGF* 58) ixn., xin., xviii, **20–22**
Phanostratus (*TrGF* 94) xin.
Philicus (*sic*) of Corcyra (*TrGF* 104) 229f., 244, 270–74, **300–5**
Philiscus of Aegina (*TrGF* 89) 203f., 205, 207, 209, 215, 224, **229–30**, 244n., 300f.
Philocles I (*TrGF* 24) 23, 43, 108, 237, 240, 307n., 406n.
Philocles II (*TrGF* 61) 23n.
Phrynichus I (*TrGF* 3) 17, 47n., 140, 244, 284, 389n.
Phrynichus II (*TrGF* 212) ixn., 406n.
Sophocles I (*TrGF* 10) 21, 25, 37, 48, 54–57, 59, 158, 241–43, 283, 285–87; *Ajax* 64f., 101, 257; *Alcmeon* 29n.; *Aleadae* 54n.; *Ale(i)tes?* 55, 406; *Amphiaraus* 69; *Antigone* 30f., 101, 257; *Chryses* 401f.; *Electra* 22; *Epigoni* 28n.; *Erigone* 406; *Eriphyle* 28, 68; *Inachus* 105n.; *Meleager* 17; *Mysians* 54n., 395, 398f.; *Nauplius* (two plays) 42f.; *Odysseus Acanthoplêx* 49, 106; *Oedipus* 31, 77, 143, 239; *Oedipus at Colonus* 45n., 182; *Oeneus* 108; *Philoctetes* 148f.; *Phoenix* 87; *Phrygians* 180n.; *Polyxena* 183n., 381n.; *Priam* 180n.; *Telepheia?* 54; *Telephus* 54n., 246; *Tereus* 138; *Thyestes* 295; *Tyro* 78f.; *Women of Trachis* 138, 208, 210
Sophocles II (*TrGF* 62) x, xviin., 22, 23n., **54–59**, 91n.
Sophocles III (TrGF 147) ixn., 55
Sosiphanes I (*TrGF* 92) xn., 17, **232–40**, 243, 271n., 274, 281
Sosiphanes II (*TrGF* 103) 233, 240, 270–72, **274**
Sositheus (*TrGF* 99) 237, 243, 270–73, **281–87**, 297n., 321

Theodectas (*TrGF* 72) ix, xi–xv *passim*, 61, 65, 76, 83, 91n., 92, **130–68**, 169, 321n
Theodorides (*TrGF* 78a) 71
Theognis (*TrGF* 28) 237, 240, 307, 309
Timesitheus (*TrGF* 214) ixn., 22, 35n., 143, 211n.
Timocles (*TrGF* 86) 23n., 169n.
Timon (*TrGF* 112) viiin., 273, 279, 280
Timotheus (*TrGF* 56) 29, 54

Xenocles I (*TrGF* 33) 60

(b) Titles *(of post-5th C. poets mentioned in this volume; superscript* S *and* S? *denote attested and likely satyr-plays)*

Acanthoplêx (*Spine-struck: = Odysseus*?) Apollodorus of Tarsus
Achilles Astydamas II, Carcinus II, Chaeremon, Diogenes Sinop., Euaretus, Sophocles II,
Adonis Dionysius, Ptolemy IV
Aeolides Lycophron
Aeolus Lycophron
Aerope Carcinus II
Aethlius Sositheus
Ajax Carcinus II, Theodectas
Ajax, Mad Astydamas II
Alcmeon Astydamas II, Euaretus, Nicomachus Alex., Theodectas, Timotheus
Alcmene Astydamas II, Dionysius
Aletes Lycophron
Aletidês Nicomachus Alex.?
Alexander Nicomachus Alex.
Alope Carcinus II
Alphesiboea Chaeremon, Timotheus
Amphiaraus(?) Carcinus II
Andromache Antiphon
Andromeda Lycophron
Antigone Astydamas II
Astragalistae (Dice-Players) Alexander of Aetolia
Athamas Astydamas II
Atreus (= *Thyestes?*) Diogenes Sinop.
Auge Aphareus

Bellerophon Astydamas II

Cassandreians Lycophron
Centaur Chaeremon$^{S?}$
Chrysippus Diogenes Sinop., Lycophron
Crotus(?) Sositheus^{S}
Cyprians Dicaeogenes

Daphnis or Lityerses Sositheus^{S}
Dionysus Chaeremon

Elephenor Lycophron
Epigoni Astydamas II
Eriphyle Nicomachus Alex.
Exagôgê Ezechiel

Geryon Nicomachus Alex.$^{S?}$?

Hector Astydamas II
Hektoros Lutra (Ransoming of Hector) Dionysius
Helen Diogenes Sinop., Theodectas
Hellenes Apollodorus Tars.
Heracles Astydamas II^{S}, Diogenes Sinop., Lycophron
Hermes Astydamas II^{S}
Hiketai (Suppliants) Lycophron
Hiketides (Suppliant Women) Apollodorus of Tarsus
Hippolytus Lycophron
Hypsipyle Cleaenetus

Iberians Sophocles II? (p. 55)
Icarians Timocles^{S}
Io Chaeremon

Jason(?) Antiphon

Laius Lycophron
Leda Dionysius
Limos (Hunger) Dionysius^{S}
Lycaon Astydamas II
Lycurgus Timocles^{S}
Lynceus Theodectas

Marathonians Lycophron
Mausolus Theodectas
Medea Carcinus II, Dicaeogenes, Diogenes Sinop., Theodorides
Meleager Antiphon, Sosiphanes I
Menedemus Lycophron^{S}
Minyans Chaeremon
Mysians Nicomachus Alex.

Nauplius Astydamas II, Lycophron
Neoptolemus Nicomachus Alex.

Odysseus Apollodorus of Tarsus, Chaeremon
Oedipus Carcinus II, Diogenes Sinop., Lycophron (x 2), Nicomachus Alex., Theodectas, Timocles (or Philocles II?)
Oeneus Chaeremon

Orestes Aphareus, Carcinus II, Theodectas,
Orphanos Lycophron
Palamedes Astydamas II
Parthenopaeus Astydamas II
Peliades (Daughters of Pelias) Aphareus
Pelopidae (Sons of Pelops) Lycophron
Pentheus Lycophron
Persis (Sack, of Troy?) Nicomachus Alex.?
Phaethon Theodorides
Pheraeans Moschion
Philoctetes Theodectas
Phoenix Astydamas II
Phorkides (Daughters of Phorkys) Timocles (or Philocles II?)[s]
Phrixus Timocles (or Philocles II?)
Polyxena Nicomachus Alex.
Rhesus anon.
Semele Carcinus II
Summachoi (Allies) Lycophron
Teknoktonos (*Child-killer*, i.e. Heracles?) Apollodorus of Tarsus
Telegonus Lycophron
Telephus Moschion
Teucer Euaretus, Nicomachus Alex.
Themistocles Moschion
Thyestes Apollodorus of Tarsus, Carcinus II(?), Chaeremon, Diogenes Sinop.
Trilogia(?) Nicomachus Alex.?
Tydeus Theodectas
Tyndareus Nicomachus Alex.
Tyro Astydamas II, Carcinus II

(c) Sources *(superscript [b] denotes brief fragments)*

Aelian: Diogenes Sinop. **[F 4]**

Aeschines: Cleaenetus **T 2**

Alexander 'Polyhistor': Ezechiel 1–269

Alexis: Cleaenetus **T 1**

Anthologia Palatina: Theodectas **F 4**, Homer Byz. **T 5, 5a(?)**, Sositheus **T 2**

'Antiatticist' Lexicon: Antiphon **F 1a**?[b]

Apostolius: Astydamas II **T 2**

Aristotle: *Eudemian Ethics*, Antiphon **F 1**; *Nicomachean Ethics*, Carcinus II **F 1b**, Theodectas **F 5b**; *Poetics*, Dicaeogenes **F 1**, Astydamas II **F 1b**, Carcinus II **F 1c**, Theodectas **F 3a**, **5a**; *Politics*, Theodectas **F 3**; *Rhetoric*, Antiphon **T 1**, **F 1b**, **2**, Carcinus II **F 1e**, **1f**, Chaeremon **T 3**, **F 4**, Theodectas **F 1**, **2**, **5**

[Aristotle]: *Mechanics*, Antiphon **F 4**; *Problems*, Chaeremon **F 16**

Athenaeus: Astydamas II **F 6**, Carcinus II **F 1d**, **2–3**, Chaeremon **F 1**, **5–9**, **12–17**, Theodectas **T 10**, **F 4**, **6**, **18**, Dionysius **T 5**, **F 1**, **12**, Cleaenetus **T 1**, Alexander Aetol. **T 8**, Philicus **T 4**

Aulus Gellius: Theodectas **T 6**

Caesius Bassus: Philicus **T 2**

Callixenus: Philicus **T 4**

Cassius Dio: Diogenes Sinop. **F 3?**

Choeroboscus: Philicus **T 2**

Christodorus: Homer Byz. **T 5**

Clement of Alexandria: Patrocles **F 2**, Theodectas **F 16**, Diogenes Sinop. **F 1h**, Moschion **F 10?**; Ezechiel **7–40**, **50–54**

Cocondrius: Chaeremon **F 41?**

Commentaries on Aristotle (*CAG*): Carcinus II **F 1b**, Theodectas **F 5b**

Demosthenes: Chaeremon **F 2**

Diodorus Siculus: Sophocles II **T 4**, Carcinus II **F 5**, Dionysius **T 1**

Diogenes Laertius: Astydamas II **T 8**, Carcinus II **T 3**, Diogenes Sinop. **T 1**, **F 1d**, **[4]**, Crates Theb. (p. 230), Homer Byz. **T 8**, Lycophron **T 5**

Dionysius of Halicarnassus: Theodectas **F 2**, Aphareus T 3 (p. 169n.)

Dioscorides: Sositheus **T 2**

Eusebius: Theodectas **F 1a**; Ezechiel 1–269

Eustathius: Chaeremon **F *1b** (p. 99 n. 12), Cleaenetus **T 1**

[Eustathius of Antioch]: Ezechiel 256–69

Fragmenta Bobiensia: Chaeremon **F 43**

Gnomologium Vaticanum: Diogenes Sinop. **[F 2**, **4]**

Harpocration: Dicaeogenes **T** 1, Carcinus II **F 6**, Aphareus T **3** (p. 169n.)

Helladius: Dionysius **F 12**

Hephaestion: Philicus **T 2**

Heraclides Ponticus: Astydamas II **T 8**

Hyginus, *Fabulae*: Adespota, pp. 394–410

Hypoth. Sophocles, *OC*: Sophocles II **T 3**

inscriptions: (Didascaliae) Astydamas II T 5, 6 (pp. 24, 30), Timocles T3?, 5? (p. 23n.); (Fasti) Astydamas II T 4–6 (p. 24), Sophocles II T 5, 6 (p. 54); (Parian Marble) Astydamas II T 3 (p. 24), Sosiphanes II T 1 (p. 274), Sosiphanes I **T 2**; (Victors Lists) Astydamas II T 3, 7 (p. 24), Theodectas T 3 (p. 130), Cleaenetus T 4 (p. 200), Homer Byz. **T 10?**; (I.Eleusis 53) Sophocles II T 7 (p. 54n.); (*IG* II^2 3775) Astydamas II **T 8(b)**; (*IG* II^3 4, 500 = II^2 3092) Dicaeogenes T 2 (p. 3n.); (*IG* V 2, 118) Chaeremon T 5 (p. 96); (*IGUR* I.223) Sophocles II T 7a, 8 (p. 55n.)

Julian (emperor): Diogenes Sinop. **T 3**, **[F 4]**

Libanius: Chaeremon **F 2**

Life of Antiphon of Rhamnous: Antiphon **T 3**

Life of Sophocles: Sophocles II **T 2**

Lucian: Dionysius **F [9]**, **10?**, **11?**

Menander: Carcinus II **F 5a**, **42**

Moero of Byzantium: Homer Byz. **T 5a(?)**

Orus, *Orthography*: Nicomachus **F 7**

papyri: (Amherst 2.10) Astydamas II **F 1i**; (Ashmol. 89B/29–33) Sophocles II **F 2**; (Bodleian f. 113 (P)) **Adesp. F 644**; (Hamb. 313) Philicus **T add.**; (Herc. 155 +339) Diogenes Sinop. **T 2**; (Herc. 207) Dicaeogenes **T 3**; (Hibeh 174) Astydamas II **F 1h;** (Louvre E 10534) Carcinus II **F 1e add.**; (Petrie 2.49(b)) Astydamas II **T 9**, Sosiphanes I **T 4**; (Oxy. 2382) **Adesp. F 664**; (Oxy. 2746) **Adesp. F 649**; (PSI XV.1476) Moschion **F 12**; (Strasb. WG 304.2) Astydamas II **F 2a**

Pausanias, *Attic Lexicon*: Astydamas II **T** 2, Carcinus II **F 1g**

Pausanias (periegete): Theodectas **T 15**

Philodemus, *On Poems*: Dicaeogenes **T 3**

Philostratus: Antiphon **T 3**

Photius: *Bibliotheca*, Antiphon **T 3**, **7**, Theodectas **T 8**, Dionysius **F 12**; *Lexicon*, Dicaeogenes **T 1**, Antiphon **[F 5^b**, **6^b]**, Astydamas **T** b, Carcinus **F 1g**, Chaeremon **F 3**, Nicomachus **F 1**, **13–16a**^{b}

Plato, *Laws*: Chaeremon **F 2**

Plutarch: *Alexander*, Theodectas **T 4**; *Moralia*, Antiphon **T 3**, Astydamas **F 1(h)**, Chaeremon **F 2**, **F 16**, Dionysius **F 4**, Diogenes Sinop. **F 3?**, **[F 5]**, Crates Theb. **F 1** (p. 231)

[Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators*: Antiphon **T 3**, **7**, Theodectas **T** 7, **15a**, Aphareus **T 2**

Pollux: Cleaenetus **T 1**

Polybius: Dionysius **F 12**

Porphyry: Theodectas **F 1a**

Proclus on Plato, *Cratylus*: Dionysius **F 12**

scholia: (Ap. Rhod.) Sosiphanes I **F 3**; (Ar. *Eccles.*) Dicaeogenes **F 6**?^{b}; (Eur. *Andr.*) Sosiphanes I **F 7**; (Eur. *Med.*) Dicaeogenes **F 1a**; (Eur. *Pho.*) Sosiphanes I **F 4**; (Hom. *Iliad*) Astydamas II **F 2**, Sosiphanes I **[F 6]**, Alexander Aetol. **F 1**; (Soph. *OC*) Astydamas **F 9**^{b}; (Theocr.) Sosiphanes I **[F 5]**. See also ‘Eustathius’, ‘Tzetzes’.

Socratic Letters: Dionysius **F 12**

Stephanus of Byzantium: Theodectas **T 2**

Stobaeus: Dicaeogenes **F 1b–5**, Patrocles **F 1**, Astydamas II **F 1c**, **5**, **7**, **8**, Carcinus II **F 4**, **7–11**, Chaeremon **F 2**, **18–38**, Theodectas **F 7–16**, Dionysius **F 2–4**, **5?**, **6?**, **[7, 8]**, Cleaenetus **F 1**, **2**, Diogenes Sinop. **F [6, 7]**, Sosiphanes **F 2**, **3**, Moschion **F 1–9**, **11**, Sositheus **F 1**, Lycophron **F 5**

Strabo: Theodectas **F 17**

Suda: Dicaeogenes **T 1**, Astydamas I **T 1**, Astydamas II **T 1**, **2**, Sophocles II **T 1**, Carcinus II **T 1**, **F 1g**, Chaeremon **T 1**, **F 3**, Theodectas **T 1**, Aphareus **T 1**, Dionysius **T 2**, Sosiphanes I **T 1**, Homer Byz. **T 1–3**, Sositheus **T 1**, Lycophron **T 3**, **4**, Alexander Aetol. **T 1**, **2**, Philicus **T 1**, Dionysiades **T 1** (p. 274n.), Nicomachus **T 1**

Synagôgê Lexeôn Chrêsimôn: Nicomachus **F 13**

Theophilus of Antioch: Dionysius **F 5?**

Theophrastus: Chaeremon **F 16**, **39**

Theopompus: Theodectas **T 8**

Timaeus: Carcinus II **F 5**, Dionysius **F 13**

Trichas: Philicus **T 2**

Tzetzes: Dionysius **T 3**, **F 2b**, **11?**, Homer Byz. **T 9**, Lycophron **T 1**, **2**, 6

Zenobius: Astydamas II **T 2**, Carcinus II **F 1a**, Dionysius **F 4**

(d) General (means 'see also (c) Sources')*

Aaron 312, 313, 315, 316n., 329, 344, 349, 350, 351f., 353, 354

Accius 369n., *Agamemnonidae* 406, *Alcmeo* 29n., *Alphesiboea* 29n., *Antigona* 30, *Arms Judgment* 65, *Astyanax* 14, 381, *Battle at the Ships* 180n., *Diomedes* 108, *Epigoni* 28, *Erigona* 406, *Eriphyle* 28, *Io* 104f., *Pelopidae* 295.

Achilles xiiif., 34–37, 43, 49, 51f., 56–58, 68f., 92, 94n., 96–100, 121, 168, 180–85, 205, 240, 246, 256, 298f., 372, 377f., 399, 410

Achilles Tatius 368, 386n., 410n.

actors xii, xiii, xvii, 55, 63,64f., 96, 118, 307n., 369n., 373, 381

Acts of the Apostles 340, 342, 343

Adespota (F 1b) 55; (F *3e) **404–6**; (F 5b) 105; (F 7a, 7b) 107n.; (F 10c) **399–403**; (F 80) 17; (F 81) 17; (F 82) 19, 137; (F 110) 136; (F 126) xviin., 211n.; (F 137) xviin., (F 188) 17; (F 392) 231; (F 477) 196; (F 515a) 55; (F 518) 127; (F 530, 531, 533) 196; (F 625) 17, 49, 109, 369n.; (F 626) 25n., 79, 369n.; (F 632) 17; (F 640b) 49, 69, 369n.; (F 641) 139; (F 644) 14, **380–85**; (F 646a) 286n., 369n.; (F 649) xviin., 35, 37, **371–79**; (F 653) 211, 369n.; (F 655) 369n.; (F 658) 369n.; (F 664) **386–93**; (F 665) 369n.; (F 667a) 50n., 369n.; (F 672a) 369n.; (F 678, 679, 684, 685, 686) xviin.; (F 679a) 56; (F 680a–b) xviin., 369n.; (F 682) 369n.; (F 701) 73.

Adonis 176–79, 193

Adrastus of Aphrodisias 12 n.

*Aelian 63, 192, 396

Aerope 62f., 294, 386n.

Aeschines of Sphettus 63, 84, 225

aether 59, 123, 235

Aethlius 284f.

Agamemnon 99f., 372., 399f., 404–6

agriculture 258f., 261f.

Aiora, ritual 405n.

Aithiolas 239f.

Ajax 64f., 136f., 161, 287

Alcmeon xiv, 28–31, 121, 136–39, 161

Aletes, Heraclid 289

Aletes, son of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra 55, 404–6

Alexander of Pherae 63, 243, 256

*Alexander 'Polyhistor' 310–365 *passim*

Alexander the Great vii, 120, 130, 135, 159, 167f., 220, 226, 229, 238

Alexandria (Egypt) 271–74, 281, 285, 296, 300, 303, 317. See also 'Museum/ Library of Alexandria'.

Alexandria Troas 281, 283, 306, 398, 401

Alope 64–67

Alphesiboea 136, 138f., 161

Amphiaraus 28f., 68f., 85, 101n., 136

Anankê: see 'Necessity'

Anaxagoras 224f.

Anaximenes of Lampsacus 63, 84

Anchialos 240

Andromache xiv, xvii, 14f., 36, 50, 51, 180–85, 379, 380–85

anecdotes 11, 25, 46f., 48, 159, 172, 196–98, 226f., 229, 281

anger 19, 113, 115, 117, 126, 127, 128, 153, 164f., 201f., 235, 238f., 249, 298f., 392
anthologies 89, 92, 174, 195, 241, 242, 269, 280, 285. See also ‘Stobaeus’.
anthropophagy 203, 207, 212f., 223. See also ‘cannibalism’.
Antigone 30–33, 265f.
Antigonus Gonatas 273, 287, 291, 295, 297, 299
Antilochus 57
Antimachus, *Thebais* 148f.
Antiphanes, comic poet 18n., 28–30, 131n., 179
Antiphon of Rhamnous 11, 13
Antisthenes 160, 204, 208, 221, 225n., 227
Aphrodite 88, 123, 124, 176–78, 179n., 279f.
Apollo (Phoebus) 34, 39, 256f., 265, 399–401, 407–10
Apollodorus of Carystus 69
Apollodorus of Cassandreia 291
Apsyrtus 6
Arabia 315, 344, 366
Aratus of Soloi 271, 283n., 291, 293, 297, 299, 301,
Archilochus 142n., 241f., 243, 386, 397n.
Aristodemus of Nyssa 237, 240
Aristophanes: *Amphiaraus* 69, *Assembly-women* 3, 50 *Birds* 402n., *Wasps* 198f., *Wealth* 20f., 50
Aristophanes of Byzantium 275, 297
Aristophon (comic poet) vii, 193
*Aristotle ix, xiii–xvi, 92, 130–32; *On Poets* 8f.; *Poetics* 17, 28–30, 32n., 49, 50, 61, 62, 93; *Rhetoric* 76n., 118, 132, 144n., 160
Arsinoe, town 363
Arsinoe, wife of Ptolemy II 291
art: see *technê*
Artapanus, historian 311, 344, 347n., 364
Artemisia 133, 135, 144, 145n., 158
Artists of Dionysus xiin., 303
Asclepiades of Tragilos 135, 240
Astyanax 14, 51, 180, 185, 380f.
Atalanta 17, 25n., 234, 397n.
Athanis, historian 191, 198
*Athenaeus ix, x, 12n., 47, 78, 91–93, 117f., 122, 131, 168, 198
Atreus 37, 212, 224, 288f., 294
Auge 89f., 394–98
Aulus Gellius 144, 145n., 159

Bacchants 109, 119, 123, 262, 409f.
Bacchus: see ‘Dionysus’
barbarians 70, 75, 87, 141, 224, 401
beauty, female 91, 98f., 109, 119, 123f., 386n., 387
Beelzephon 337, 345, 363
Bosporan kingdom xiin.
Brutus, M. Junius 210f., 221
burial 30–32, 35, 59, 98–101, 247–49, 251, 256f., 258–60, 265, 342, 366
burning bush 312–16, 318n., 329, 349–52, 358, 361
Byzantium viii, 273, 280

calendars 354, 367
Callimachus 293
Callirhoe 119, 137
Candaules 386–91
cannibalism 251, 259. See also ‘anthropophagy’.
captatio benevolentiae 257
Caria viii, 131, 144, 407f., 410
Cassandra 36f., 182n., 288, 371–79
Cercyon xiv, 64–67, 148
Chamaeleon 47
children 7, 9, 10, 17, 115, 155, 201, 384
Choerilus of Athens 64, 66
Choerilus of Iasos 63, 84
Choerilus of Samos 48
*Choeroboscus, George 270–75
chorou (XOPOY, notation) 38f., 49f.
choruses xv–xvii, 4, 5n., 34, 35, 50, 73, 94n., 101, 103, 133, 171n., 173, 175, 178, 180, 184, 197, 246, 283, 290n., 291n., 314–16, 343, 350, 371–73, 378, 387, 392, 396, 409f.,
Choum 316, 327, 345
Chryseis 399–403
Chryses 399–403

Chrysippus (Stoic) 203, 205, 207, 212n., 223
Cicero, Marcus 131, 402
Cicero, Quintus 406n.
Cinaethon, epic poet 239n., 405
Cleanthes 203, 207, 213, 281, 286n.
Clearchus of Soloi 47, 168
*Clement of Alexandria 311, 317, 341f., 353
*commentaries on Aristotle 12n., 65n., 76n., 85f., 160, 161
covenant, of God with the Jewish nation 342, 351
crasis 266, 321, 389n.
Cratinus 54, 187
Croesus 346, 389
Crotus 283, 286
culture, human 258f., 263
Cybele (Great Mother) 88
Cynics 203, 205, 208f., 211, 216–19, 223f., 228–31, 241, 280
Cyrene viii

Danaus xv, 104, 140–43, 162
dance xviin.
dead, treatment of 98, 249, 251, 253, 257, 258f., 265f.
death 21, 22, 51, 53, 90, 148, 221, 239, 295, 335, 356f.
Deiphobus 37, 52, 181, 371–79
Delphi, Delphic oracle 15, 216, 314n., 388, 404–6, 407f.
Demeter 72, 81, 87–89, 160, 191n., 251, 259, 261f., 264, 287, 300f., 303
Demetrius, historian 311, 327, 337, 344, 345, 352, 360, 362n., 365
Demetrius of Phaleron 241f., 293
Demetrius, *On Style* 118
Demophon 5
Dictys of Crete 181, 183n., 405n.
didsacalic records vii, xin., 23, 24, 25, 58, 233, 281, 307. See also '*inscriptions'.
Dio Chrysostom 204f., 216–19
*Diodorus Siculus 23, 58f., 87–89, 173, 192, 261, 264
*Diogenes Laertius 48, 84, 203–5, 212, 225n., 226, 229, 230f., 280, 288
Diomedes 98f., 106, 108, 121, 137, 146f., 160
Dionysia, rural 3
Dionysius, comic poet 192, 195, 196
Dionysius of Halicarnassus 131, 159, 169n., 192
Dionysius II of Syracuse xii, 60, 63, 84, 192, 196n.
Dionysus 31, 45, 78, 101n., 107, 109, 121, 247, 251, 262, 265, 280, 300f., 405n.
*Dioscorides 47n., 281–83, 285f.
Dioscuri 21, 22, 186, 397n.
directors, professional 171n., 173n., 201
dithyrambs 5, 118
divine will: see 'gods'
Dorians 130, 283, 286, 287, 289
Doris (wife of Dionysius I) 196f.
dreams 312, 313, 327, 346–49
Dura Europos, murals 361, 362, 365

Ecclesiasticus 318
Egypt, Egyptians 104, 141, 167, 168, 259, 312–17, 321, 325, 331, 333, 335, 337, 340–41, 349, 352–57, 360–66
ekphrasis 199, 366
Electra 22, 404–6
Eleusis 54, 72f., 88f., 137, 261, 301, 303n.
Elim, oasis 312f., 314, 315f., 320, 339, 365–68
embolima xvi, 50
Empedocles 125f., 158, 225, 266
Endymion 284f.
Ennius 369n.; *Ajax* 65; *Alcmeo* 29n.; *Andromacha* 14, 381; *Ransoming of Hector* 180n.
Enoch 347
envy (*phthonos*) 27, 46, 48, 83, 90, 189, 196, 342
Ephippus, comic poet 91, 177, 306n.
Epicureans 22, 105, 201, 227, 241, 242n., 266. See also 'Philodemus'.
Epicurus 241f., 259n., 264, 266
Epigoni 28f.
epigrams 27, 34, 46–48, 122, 132, 231, 233, 238, 273, 277, 280, 281f., 285f., 397n.
Epiphanius, *Panarion* 312n.

Epirus vii
Epyllium Telephi 277n.
Eratosthenes 275n., 283n., 293, 405n.
Erinyes 28, 99f., 256
Eriphyle 28–31, 68, 136, 161
erôs (desire, love) 7, 31, 98, 99, 105, 117, 124, 176, 179n., 181, 234, 408f.
Eros (god) 111, 124, 125, 177
Ethiopians 157, 168, 315, 343f., 345
Etna 81, 89
etymologies 198f., 341, 359
Eubulus, comic poet 91, 111, 125, 173n., 187, 192, 197
eugeneia: see 'nobility'
Eupheme 283n.
euphonist theory 84, 118f.
Eupolemus, Jewish historian 311, 345
*Eusebius 161, 224, 310f., 317n., 341, 357f., 360, 362
*Eustathius of Antioch 311
euteleia: see 'frugality'
Exodus. biblical book 312–14, 316n., 318–20, 340–67
Ezechiel, prophet 347

Fasti: see '*inscriptions'.
Fate (*Moira*) 247, 254, 255f.
fathers 115, 127, 155. See also 'parents'.
firstborn, Egyptians' slaughtered 349, 354, 355; consecration of 354, 357
flowers 88, 97, 103, 105, 107, 109, 119, 121f., 122, 124
fools, foolishness 111, 113, 126, 177, 189, 204n., 216, 230, 281n.
fortune (*tuchê*) 21, 79, 89, 101, 115, 120, 126, 143, 157, 194, 205n., 210f., 219, 221, 225, 226f., 228, 235, 239, 253, 255, 267f., 269, 295
frankness of speech (*parrhêsia*) 249, 257
friends 9, 19. See also '*philia*'.
frugality (*euteleia*) 223, 228

garlands 90, 103, 121, 135
gnomai, gnomologies 3, 89, 92f., 161, 195, 218, 220, 254
God (Yahweh) 311f., 313n., 315f., 316, 318–20, 323, 327, 329–35, 339, 342, 346–58, 360f., 363–65, 367
gods, divine will xiv, 22, 37, 49, 79, 89, 100, 105n., 117, 120, 123, 127, 140f., 153, 163f., 166, 179, 194, 208f., 239, 247, 255f., 258n., 265, 349, 384, 395f.; (*ex machina*) xiv, xv, 31, 33n., 101n., 346, 388, 396
good sense: see 'wisdom'
Great Mother: see Cybele
Gregory of Nazianzus 226
grief 45, 53, 65, 67, 89, 115, 121, 151, 176, 185, 196, 201, 202, 215, 380
Gyges 386–93

Hades 81, 88, 235, 295, 303n.
Haemon xiv, 30–33, 76n., 77
Halicarnassus xin., xii, 135, 144
hand of God 361, 357, 365
Harpocration, Homeric commentator 237, 240
Hecataeus of Abdera 259
Hecataeus of Miletus 366
Hector xiv, xv, xvi, 14, 34–37, 41–43, 49–52, 180–82, 287, 371–85
Helen 140f., 163f., 165n., 166, 186f., 205, 206n., 237, 290n., 380, 383, 385, 386n., 404
Helenus 15, 34, 36f., 39, 49
Heliopolis 340, 365f.
Helios: see 'Sun'
Hellenistic tragedy (form) 316f., 368, 375, 388n.
*Hephaestion, metrician 270, 274f., 300
Heracleodorus 84, 95, 118f.
Heracles 32f., 72, 89f., 105, 172, 205n., 208–11, 221, 225, 226f., 231, 298, 395, 396, 398n.
*Heraclides Ponticus 48f.
Hermione 15, 237, 240, 297, 404
Hermippus of Smyrna 131, 135, 145n., 159f., 168
Herodotus 346, 361, 366, 368, 369, 387–89, 392
Hesiod 47n., 166, 258, 262f., 280, 363

[Hesiod], *Catalogue of Women* 140f., 239, 284, 289, 397n.; other frs. 94n., 365
Hippias of Elis 169, 171
Homer, epic poet 27, 47n., 63, 137, 185, 242, 279, 280. See also '*Iliad*'.
'Homer son of Euphron' 279, 280
hunger 172, 228f.
*Hyginus, *Fables* x, xiiin., xiv, xv, xviin., 31–33, 55, 64, 85, 142n., 289, 294, 369f., **394–410**
Hyginus, C. Julius 135, 144, 159
Hypermestra xv, 140–43, 162

Icarus, king 407–10
Idas, son of Apaharus 397
idleness 155, 166, 219, 228, 230
Iliad 22, 34–37, 45n., 49–53, 68f., 99, 160, 180, 194, 199, 240, 255, 256f., 289, 298f., 372–74, 377–79, 393, 397n., 399n., 400
Iliona 369f.
incest 66, 163, 212n., 218f., 224, 294, 395
*inscriptions viiin., ixf., xvii, 3, 25n., 27, 46f., 54, 55, 60n., 97f., 131n., 133, 171, 241f., 259n., 286n., 287, 290n., 300n., 306n.; (Didascaliae) 23n., 25, 30, 60, 93n., 131n., 169; (Fasti) 54, 60n., 91n.; (Parian Marble) 232, 233, 237, 272, 274; (Victors Lists) 21n., 24, 58f., 60, 64n., 83, 90n., 130, 131n., 169, 200, 202, 271, 279
intelligence: see 'wisdom'
Io 144f., 122
Ionia viii
Iphigenia 149, 346, 399–403, 404–6
Isis 259
Isocrates of Apollonia 133, 157, 159
Isocrates of Athens xiiin., 23, 25, 131, 133, 135, 157, 159, 169, 171, 260
Isles of the Blessed 301, 305
Ivy 103, 121, 242, 283, 287, 303, 305

Jacob 321, 329, 340, 352
Jason, hero 70–75, 86, 105f., 215
Jason of Pherae 247, 248n.
Jethro/Iothor 344. See also 'Raguel'.
Jocasta 76f., 205n., 239
John of Damascus 310n.
Josephus, T. Flavius 431, 342, 344, 347n., 352, 356, 362, 363n., 364, 365
Jubilees, Book of 340, 342
judgment (good, bad) 27, 53, 115, 127
*Julian (emperor) 204, 207, 224, 227
justice, injustice 153, 164, 186, 187, 195, 221, 227, 228, 258f., 262f., 264, 265, 354

Keturah 344
kinship 16
Kuamitês ('Bean-hero') 137, 160

Lactantius, *On the Phoenix* 368
Laodamas 180, 185, 194f.
Law (*Nomos*) 251, 258, 259nn., 262f., 264f., 313n., 346f., 356, 391
Leda 140f., 186f.
Lenaea 24, 58, 60, 83, 91n., 131, 169, 171n., 173, 175, 180, 192, 200, 202, 307
'Letter of Polyidus to Darius' 120
Leucippe 407–10
Libya 293, 315, 325, 343f.
Licymnius (poet etc.) 95, 118
**Life of Sophocles* 158, 286
Little Iliad 64
Lobon of Argos 158f.
locus amoenus 365
love: see '*erôs*', '*philia*'
*Lucian 174, 196, 197f., 209f.
Lycophron, *Alexandra* 99, 182n., 183n., 199, 243, 288, 289, 293, 307, 375n., 389n.
Lycus of Rhegium 291, 293
Lynceus xv, 140–43, 162
Lysias 60, 81, 89f., 192

Macedonia vii, xii
maenads: see 'bacchants'
Malalas, John 142n., 181n.
manliness, unmanliness 98, 219, 225
Marah 313n., 365
marriage (good, bad) 115, 127, 139, 155
Mausolus 130f., 133, 135, 144–46, 157f., 159

Medea xiv, 6f., 31, 70–75, 85–87, 138, 161, 214f., 369n., 370
Medus 369f.
Meleager xiiif., 16–19, 106, 234
Memnon 57, 168
*Menander xv, xvi, 25, 50, 65, 81, 89, 93, 118, 238f., 241f., 317
Menedemus of Eretria 225, 273, 286n., 288, 293
Menelaus 76, 99, 163f., 165n., 166, 237, 239, 266, 404
Menoeceus 235, 239
merkavah: see 'throne, heavenly'.
messengers xiv, 35, 50, 72, 199, 257, 312–16, 319f., 321n., 335f., 360–65, 396, 404, 405
Metapontius 7
metres: anapaestic 57, 307n., 309n., 380f.; choriambic 300, 303; iambic 320, 351, 371f., 372n., 378, 389n. See also 'resolution, metrical'.
Midiam/Madiam 327, 343f.
mime 375, 410n.
Minyans 104f.
*Moero ('Myro') of Byzantium 270, 276, 277n., 278, 279, 280, 283
Moira: see 'Fate'
Monimus (Cynic philosopher) 241f.
Moon, moonlight 109, 123f., 234f., 238, 333, 347, 354f., 363
mosaics 286n., 409f.
Moses 310–68 *passim*
mothers 17. See also 'parents'.
Museum/Library of Alexandria 271, 273n., 288, 297
music xviin., 8, 56, 70, 86, 88, 228f., 242, 286, 304n., 369n.
Mysia 394–98, 399

Naevius, *Hector Proficiscens* 35
nature (*phusis*) 153, 164, 191, 203, 207, 218f., 224, 225, 226, 251, 258, 264
Naucrates of Erythrae 133, 135, 157
Nauplius 42f.
Nausicrates, comic poet 201f., 306n.
Necessity (*Anankê*) 111, 175, 247, 251, 255f., 258, 264
Neoptolemus 15, 148, 151, 167, 182n., 237, 240
New Comedy xv, xvi
*Nicolaus of Damascus 310n., 386
Nicomachus, comic poet 306
Nicomachus, actor(s) 307n.
Nicostratus, mythographer 235, 239
Nicostratus, son of Menelaus and Helen 237, 239
nobility (*eugeneia*) 45, 53, 140f., 155, 162, 167
Nomos: see 'Law'.
Nostoi (Returns) 42
Numbers, Book of 344, 347, 362, 363, 365

Odysseus 4f., 42, 49, 64f., 98, 106., 120, 136f., 160, 167, 209, 256, 287, 343, 369n.
Oedipus 28, 31, 45n., 146f., 162f., 212, 216–19, 224, 239, 396n.
Oeneus 17, 106–9, 123, 147–49
old age 117, 128, 157, 255, 301, 305
Olympic Games 175, 192, 284
Onesicritus of Aegina 229
Onesicritus of Astypalaea 157, 168
Orestes 22, 31, 55, 76f., 147, 149, 161, 202, 237, 314n., 396, 399–403, 404–6
Orphic texts 259, 263n.
Osiris 259
Ovid 16, 160, 176, 402n.

Pacuvius 369n.; *Arms Judgment* 65; *Atalanta* 370, 397n.; *Chryses* 369, 402f.; *Iliona* 369; *Medus* 369; *Periboea* 108
pain 43, 53, 248f., 151, 179, 253, 265f.
paintings 4, 47n., 98, 123f., 230, 300, 401. See also 'vase-paintings'.
Panainos, painter 98
pantomime 409f.
*papyri ixn., x, xi, xvif.; (Berlin 13927) 410n.; (Grenf. 2.1 etc.) 109; (Herc. 1018) 223n.; (Herc. 1088) 105n.; (Hibeh 3) 25n., 79; (Köln 241) 69; (Oxy. 2454) 211; (Oxy. 5075) 35; (*PSI* 282) 300; (Sorb. 2252) 50n.; (Tebt. 268) 181n.
parents 9, 10, 114, 115, 140, 155, 201, 213. See also 'fathers', 'mothers'.
parrhêsia. See 'frankness of speech'.

Parthenopaeus 101n., 394–98
Pasiphon 'son of Lucianus' 215, 225
Passover (Pascha) 312–16, 319f., 333–35, 349f., 354–60
patricide 216, 223
Patroclus 34, 37, 51, 52, 68, 205, 255, 298f., 378
*Pausanias, periegete 15, 77, 98, 142, 160, 284f., 289, 397n.
Pausimachus 84
Pelion, Mount 378
Penthesilea 98f.
Pentheus 102f., 121
performance, theatrical xv, 70, 86, 95, 97, 118, 144, 204f., 242n., 273f., 287, 288, 303n., 318f., 350, 373–75, 409f.
Pergamum 15, 398f.
Periboea 106, 109, 123, 149f.
peripeteia 143
Persephone 72, 81, 87–89, 177f., 303
Pharaoh 312, 313, 314n., 315, 316n., 232, 325, 329, 331, 335, 340, 349, 350, 352, 354, 357, 360, 362n.,
Pherae xiin., 246–48
Philemon, comic poet 27, 46, 118
philia (affection, love, friendship) 17, 31, 125. See also 'friends', 'kinship'.
Philippides, comic poet 69
Philiscus, comic poet 179, 229f.
Philiscus (work of Diogenes Sinop.) 204, 207, 213, 224, 229
Philiscus of Cos 300n.
Philiscus of Miletus 229
Philo of Alexandria 319n., 341, 342, 344, 347, 353, 356, 362, 364
Philochorus 260
Philoctetes xiv, 57–59, 67, 148–51, 167
*Philodemus 3, 8f., 61, 84, 92f., 105, 118f., 201, 203f., 205n., 212f., 216, 223f., 281n.
Philostratus 181
Philoxenus of Cythera 175, 189
Phlious 280, 285, 286, 287
Phoenix 99, 237, 238, 240
phoenix (bird) 311, 313, 319, 320, 339, 365–68
phthonos: see 'envy'
phusis: see 'nature'
Pi-hahiroth 363
Pindar 5
plagiarisms 161, 268
plagues (of Egypt) 312, 313f., 316n., 320, 321n., 331, 349f., 352–54, 360, 364
Plato, comic poet 105, 125, 179
*Plato, philosopher 8, 11n., 51, 84, 131, 133, 164, 169, 173, 177, 197, 198, 203, 212, 219, 264, 311, 386
pleasure(s) 67, 151, 155, 166, 219, 221, 225, 227, 253, 266, 268, 301, 363
Pleiad, poets 232f., **270–75**, 277, 283, 291, 296f., 299, 303, 389n.
Pleisthenes, actor 64, 65
Pleisthenes, son of Atreus 294f.
Plexippus 16f.
plot-construction 31, 69, 132, 143
*Plutarch 25, 61, 63, 130, 159, 164, 192, 210, 227, 247, 260
*[Plutarch] 11, 159, 160
Polycritus of Mende 84
Polyphron of Pherae 247
Polyxena 119, 124, 180–83, 185
ponos: see 'toil'
*Porphyry 161
poverty 111, 126, 127f., 189, 223, 228
Priam 36f., 50, 180–85, 371–79
pride 115, 235
Proclus, *Chrestomathia* 15, 64, 98
Procne 138, 309n., 386n.
prologues xiv, 31, 34, 49, 88, 123, 193, 282, 310n., 312, 313, 316, 320, 321n., 340–43, 388, 396, 401, 408, 410
Prometheus 104, 105n., 251, 258, 263, 264
Protagoras 258f., 260, 264
Protogeneia 284
Protogenes, painter 230, 300
proverbs 10, 26, 45–47, 51, 64, 91, 120f., 125, 126, 149n., 161, 197, 226, 228, 267
Ptolemy Chennus 181n.
Ptolemy of Mendes, historian 366n.
Ptolemy II Philadelphus 232, 270, 291, 293, 297, 300, 303
Ptolemy III Euergetes 367
Ptolemy IV Philopator 179, 275
Pylades 396, 399–403

Python, *Agen* 286n.

Quintus of Smyrna 98, 160

Raguel 312–16, 325, 343–49
reading/recitation of dramatic texts 118, 144f., 173, 192, 204, 273, 318, 319n.
recognitions xvf., 4, 5, 29f., 31, 32, 49, 62, 146, 148f., 369, 370, 395f., 404f., 408, 410n.
Red Sea/Sea of Reeds 312, 313f., 315, 335f., 344, 360–65, 367
revivals of plays 59, 64n., 92
resolution, metrical 50, 52, 164, 243n., 244n., 269, 320, 353
Rhesus, tragedy vii, xi, xii, xiiin., xv, xvi
rhetoric 61, 65, 93, 95, 101, 131–33, 135, 137, 139, 147, 158, 161, 239, 240, 242, 258f., 260, 267, 320
riddles (*ainigmata*) 77, 117, 125, 128, 133, 146–48, 157, 159, 162, 163 168, 199, 217–19, 377

Sagittarius, constellation 283n.
satyr-plays viiin., xviin., 25, 29n., 53, 69, 93, 105, 108, 128, 131n., 158, 163, 171n., 172f., 176, 199, 205n., 217, 243f., 273, 280, 281, 282f., 285–87, 288, 293, 297, 298f., 301, 368n.
satyrs 242, 283, 285–87, 303
Satyrus 203, 204, 207, 227, 229
self-control 67, 83, 151, 223
self-sufficiency 221, 227
Seneca 14, 182n., 317
sensation (*aisthêsis*) 253, 266
Sepphora 312–16, 325, 327, 343–45, 350
Septuagint 311n., 312, 317, 318, 319, 352; language 343, 349, 352, 353, 354, 362. See also '*Exodus*', '*Numbers*'.
Sermon on Mary (Coptic text) 366
Servius, on *Aeneid* 14, 403n.
Seven against Thebes 28, 30, 68, 101n., 259, 397
shame 13, 65, 155, 167, 387, 391, 392.
Sicily vii, viii, xii, 83, 87–89, 171, 175, 177, 293, 299
silence 83, 90, 103, 121, 189, 195, 283n.
silverware 241, 333, 356, 401
Simmias of Rhodes 303
Simonides 5
Sinai, Mount 313n., 327, 346–48, 357
skiagraphia 124
Sminthe, Smintheion 399f.
song, actors' xvii, 371, 375f.
sons: see 'children'
sophists 53, 191, 217
Sosibius, scholar 240n.
Sosicrates 203, 207
Sotion 203f., 207, 224
Sphinx 146f., 217–19, 235
stagecraft: see 'performance'.
stars 62, 270, 327, 346–49, 391, 392f.
statues 11n., 25–27, 45–48, 97, 119f., 124, 130, 135, 137, 159, 198, 241, 243, 277n., 279n., 285, 286n., 287, 401
*Stobaeus ix, x
Stoics 203f., 205n., 207, 211, 223f., 225, 230, 240
*Strabo 167f., 272, 274, 400n.
*Suda ix, x, 25, 54, 58f., 83f., 97, 117f., 130, 144, 157f., 159, 205, 224, 229f., 232f., 237f., 238n., 270–72, 272n., 274, 275n., 281, 306f., 307n.
Sun (Helios) 145n., 153, 157, 165f., 168, 223, 235, 337, 347, 363, 365, 368, 377, 379, 393
synthesis (composition) 118
Syracuse vii, xin., xiin., 11, 60, 63, 81, 83, 84, 87f., 172–75, 172n., 191, 233, 281

technê (art), technology 8, 19, 258, 259n., 263, 264
Telegonus 31, 49
Telephus 28, 53, 246f., 247n., 256, 343, 394–98
Telephus Frieze 398
Tennes (tragedy) 165
Tertullian 208f.
Teucer 5, 65, 306, 315n.
Teuthrania 395, 398n.
Teuthras 394–98
Theatre of Dionysus 5, 27, 45f., 48, 280
Themistocles 244f., 267
Theodectas (son) 130, 133, 158, 159

Theonoe 407–10
Theophilus of Antioch 187, 195, 213
Theopompus 133, 135, 144, 157, 159, 247
Theos Hypsistos 364f.
Thersites 96–101, 121
Theseus 64, 66, 67n., 151, 163, 249, 257, 260, 290n.
Thestor, son of Calchas 407–10
Thoas 399–403
throne, heavenly 327, 346–49
Thurii 20, 21n.
Thyestes 28, 163, 165, 189, 191, 199, 204f., 212f., 224, 262, 289, 294f.
*Timaeus, historian 173, 191, 192, 199
time 27, 111, 113, 126, 153, 155, 165, 251, 258n., 263f., 314, 354, 367
Timon of Phlious 273, 279, 280
Tiresias 125, 147, 163, 216
titles (of tragedies) 28n., 61n., 78n., 96f., 194n.
toil (*ponos*) 151, 166, 208, 210, 219, 223, 225, 228, 230, 342
truth 31, 126, 207
tuchê: see 'fortune'
Tydeus xv, 106f., 109, 123, 146–49
tyrannicides 11, 13, 198
tyranny, tyrants 63, 171, 177, 187, 195, 212, 247, 291, 391
Tyro xv
*Tzetzes, John x, 99, 172f., 180–83, 192, 194f., 197f., 270n., 271n., 274, 276n., 277, 280

Varro, M. Terentius 209
vase-paintings x, 7, 25n., 32f., 36f., 52, 72f., 92, 97–101, 105, 108n., 143, 177f., 183, 184n., 375n., 389n.
Victors Lists: see '*inscriptions'.
vines 107, 117, 122, 128, 251, 280
Violence (*Bia*) 251, 258, 262f.
virtue 79, 141, 171, 187, 205n., 208, 210f., 214, 221, 226f., 257

water 111, 125f., 157, 223, 228, 337f., 341, 345, 352, 353, 365, 367
wealth 20, 83, 90, 115, 127f., 221, 223, 239, 386
wine 45, 53, 81, 90, 107, 111, 125, 262, 405n.
wisdom: 9, 111, 113, 115, 126f., 207, 214f., 217f., 219, 221, 223, 226, 228, 264
women 17, 79, 109, 119, 138f., 205n., 386n.

Xanthus, *Lydian History* 386

Yahweh: see 'God'.

Zeno of Citium 212n., 213, 223, 230, 241, 242n., 280n.
Zeus 51, 81, 87n., 104f.,140n., 164, 177f., 186f., 251, 255f., 259, 262f., 264, 283n., 284, 309, 398

Corrections to Volume One

p. xvii, note 35 at end: for '2013b' read '2014b'.
p. xx, line 20: for 'classics' read 'classic'.
p. xx, note 48: for 'other' read 'others'.
p. xxi, line 10: for 'surivived' read 'survived'.
p. 4, **T 2** text: add ']' after '*letters*'.
p. 10, **F [4]**, line 5, read 'δικέρως, τίθεμαι βωμῶν ἁγίων'.
p. 15, line 11: for 'comedies' read 'songs'.
p. 48, line 6: close quote after 'choerilean.
p. 60, line 7: for 'Myrmidons' read '*Myrmidons*'.
p. 60, line 10: delete '*See also . . . in Vol. 2.*'
p. 81, note 4: delete semi-colons after '*TrGF* 1' and '*TrGF* 2'.
p. 111, end of note 6: for '1646' read '1646f.', and for 'fr. 276 Pfeiffer' read '*Aetia* fr. 190a Harder (= *SH* 276), 11'.
p. 123, **F 3**, last line: after 'Iophon' add 'also'.
p. 141, note 1: for '4th c.' read '4th C.'
p. 145, fourth line from foot: after 'for' read 'I reckon I'll be filled with much fine wisdom from you. My wisdom would be . . . (etc.)'.
p. 156, line 17: for 'Ipohon' read 'Iophon'.
p. 163, **F 13**: for 'the drunkard . . . who does he lie beside?' read 'the word *paroinos* ('drunk') . . . in whom is it found?'.
p. 172, line 4: for 'Agathon's' read 'Sophocles' '.
p. 173, line 13: after '1999–2000' change period to comma.
p. 176, **F 13**: replace 'a punning question . . . (*para*) someone.' with 'a demand to know where in Attic literature the word πάροινος is attested (Pontianus responds by quoting Antiphanes fr. 144 *PCG*)'.
p. 190 n. 26: for '3012' read '3021'.
p. 239, line 7 (= verse 10): for 'κρέκουσας' read 'κρεκούσας'.
p. 246, lines 18f.: change the entry 'Csapo, E. forthcoming' to 'Csapo, E. and Wilson, P. 2020. *A Social and Economic History of the Theatre to 300 BC*', and place this entry after 'Csapo, E. and Wilson, P. 2015'.
p. 247: after 'Erbse, H. etc.' add:

Fantuzzi, M. 2007. Epigram and theater. In P. Bing, J. S. Bruss (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden): 475–95.

Farmer, M. 2017. *Tragedy on the Comic Stage.* New York.

p. 249, line 15: for 'Tragödenvers' read 'Tragödienvers'.
p. 250, lines 1–2: for '1995' and 'Munich' read '1996' and 'Stuttgart'.
p. 253: after 'Nails, D. etc.' add:

Nervegna, S. 2014. Performing classics: the tragic canon in the fourth century and beyond. In E. Csapo et al. (eds), *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B.C.* (Berlin): 157–88.

p. 261, col. 2, line 4 from foot: delete '(' before '*Persians*'.